

92 -

3

92 F 459c v.3

Cross

The History of  
Greece

92 F 459c

v.3

## Carnegie Institute of Technology

### Library

PITTSBURGH, PA.

#### Rules for Lending Books:

1. Reserved books may be used only in the library until 8 P. M. After that hour they may be requested for outside use, due the following morning at 9:30. Ask at the desk about weekend borrowing privileges.
2. Books not of strictly reference nature, and not on reserve may be borrowed for longer periods, on request. Date due is stamped on date slip in book.
3. A fine of five cents an hour is charged on overdue reserved book. Two cents a day fine is charged on overdue unreserved books.

1978  
300  
Bechtel  
1978

卷之三






THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING



PUBLISHED ON THE FOUNDATION  
ESTABLISHED IN MEMORY OF  
WILLIAM McKEAN BROWN







*Stüttlings, Landrat Söder*

THE HISTORY  
OF  
HENRY FIELDING  
BY  
WILBUR L. CROSS

AUTHOR OF  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH NOVEL  
THE LIFE AND TIMES OF LAURENCE STERNE



VOLUME THREE

NEW HAVEN  
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON · HUMPHREY MILFORD · OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

MDCCLXXVIII

COPYRIGHT, 1918, BY  
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

FIRST PUBLISHED, SEPTEMBER, 1918

## CONTENTS

### VOLUME THREE

Chapter		Page
XXVI.	Last Illness . . . . .	1
XXVII.	A Voyage to Lisbon . . . . .	22
XXVIII.	The End of Life . . . . .	52
XXIX.	Library and Manuscripts . . . . .	75
XXX.	Survivors . . . . .	112
 The Fame of Fielding:		
XXXI.	The Shadow of Arthur Murphy . . . . .	125
XXXII.	Old Controversies over Fielding's Art and Morality . . . . .	151
XXXIII.	Fielding in France and Germany . . . . .	177
XXXIV.	Defamers and Apologists . . . . .	195
XXXV.	Later Biographers and Critics . . . . .	226
XXXVI.	Fielding as He Was . . . . .	258
 Bibliography:		
I.	Fielding's Published Works . . . . .	289
II.	Uncertain or Doubtful Authorship . . . . .	335
III.	Works Erroneously Attributed to Fielding . . . . .	340
IV.	Dramas on Fielding or His Works . . . . .	350
V.	Letters and Manuscripts . . . . .	358



## ILLUSTRATIONS

### VOLUME THREE

Fielding's Tomb at Lisbon . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
<i>From a photograph, March 1918.</i>	Facing page
View of Ryde in the Isle of Wight . . . . .	34
<i>From an engraving by Samuel Rawle after a drawing by John Nixon.</i>	
Frontispiece to <i>Sir John Fielding's Jests</i> : "Representing the Worshipful Author and his Companions in High Mirth and Jollity over a Flowing Bowl at the Bedford-Arms" . . . . .	114
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Arthur Murphy, Esq. . . . .	126
<i>From an engraving by William Ridley after a painting by Nathaniel Dance.</i>	
Reduced Facsimile of a Page from <i>Tom Jones, Comédie Lyrique</i> . . . . .	182
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Title Page of <i>Tumble-Down Dick</i> . . . . .	300
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Title Page of <i>The Crisis</i> . . . . .	304
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Title Page of <i>Reise nach der andern Welt</i> . . . . .	326
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Title Page of <i>Aventures de Roderick Random; par Fielding</i> . . . . .	344
<i>From a copy in the Library of Yale University.</i>	
Autograph Receipt for Twenty Pounds in Payment for the <i>Despairing Debauchee</i> and the <i>Covent-Garden Tragedy</i> . . . . .	360
<i>From the original in the Adam Collection, Buffalo, N. Y.</i>	



THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING



## CHAPTER XXVI

### LAST ILLNESS

The magnificent constitution with which nature endowed Fielding began to show signs of strain as early as the winter of 1741-1742. At that time occurred, so far as we have any record of it, his first serious illness. The portrait of the dissipated Fielding which his enemies drew is quite unjust. Fielding was most liberal in his diet and he drank freely. There were times when he felt the pinch of poverty; but as a rule he was able, it would appear, to keep his larder and his cellar adequately supplied with all things necessary to his generous mode of living. Indeed, concern for what he should eat and for what he should drink, is almost humorously manifest in parts of his "*Voyage to Lisbon*" to be quoted in the next chapter. While writing for the stage, he passed several months each year at East Stour in hunting and other physical recreations; but those long vacations had to be given up when the Licensing Act effectually blocked his dramatic career and he was forced to turn to general literature for the support of his family. He thereupon sold his farm. Subsequent visits to Bath and Salisbury, however conducive to rest, could not afford him the opportunity for the exercises to which he had been accustomed since youth. His literary labours now became incessant. At one and the same time he worked hard at the law and, with the aid of Ralph, conducted "*The Champion*." His usual hour for going to bed seems to have been one or two o'clock in the morning. No body was ever built to withstand abuse like this. Free indulgence of the

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

appetites, insufficient physical exercise, late hours, intense application to literature and study—all these, combined with the declining health of a wife and the death of a daughter, will do the business for any man who ever walked this earth. Nothing else is needed in order to explain why Fielding was laid low with the gout in the thirty-fifth year of his age.

Thenceforth Fielding was subject to periodic attacks of this painful disease. There is no evidence that he ever permanently altered, in consequence of them, his manner of life in any essentials. The gout would put him to bed, its acute stage would pass with rest, and he was the old Fielding again. The truth is, only one physician of the time consistently pursued the proper treatment of the disease. That was the great Boerhaave of Leyden. He took all meat, alcohol, and acids from his patients, and put them on a milk diet varied with bread and butter, vegetables, cooked fruits, grains or cereals. It was a moderate regimen certain to benefit if not to cure anyone who tried it. English physicians, while they paid some heed to the practice of Boerhaave, habitually beat the devil round the bush. If they advised a temperate use of meat in general, they made an exception in favour of venison. Milk they thought good, but they would mix the milk whey with an equal quantity of old canary. The drink at meals should be, according to one authority, a pint of red port added to a quart of Bristol water; and if the sufferer were advanced in years, he would do well to substitute rum for port in the same proportion. Likewise many of the current “tinctures” for the gout had, whatever else they might contain, alcohol as the basis. Quite naturally, in this state of medical opinion, Fielding was not certain of any connection between high living and the disease with which he was afflicted. To him the gout, like jealousy, was a constitutional humour in the blood, which worked itself out at in-

## LAST ILLNESS

tervals in pain. He so described the disease in 1746 while writing “*Tom Jones*,” where, like Lucian, he was facetious over its torments.

But within the next three or four years, recurring attacks compelled him to take a sober view of his condition. During that period he spent some thousands of hours on “*Tom Jones*,” endeavouring to put into it all the genius that God had given him; and immediately after the novel was completed, he began to devote his days and nights to the administration of justice. The issue was inevitable. Late in the autumn of 1749, he became very ill of gout accompanied with fever.\* While the torments were upon him, he called in Dr. Thomas Thompson. That story I have partially told elsewhere. This man was nothing but “an empiric,” or quack, who had the reputation—whether deserved or not is immaterial—of letting his patients die of minor diseases. He had been physician to Frederick Prince of Wales; and when Fielding employed him, he was the medical adviser of the Duke of Roxborough, the Earl of Middlesex, and other gentlemen of fashion. Though a general practitioner, he claimed most success with gout and smallpox, on which he wrote treatises. When Fielding’s fit of the gout had run its course, the patient attributed his recovery not to nature, but to the remedies of Dr. Thompson, or “Dr Thumpscull” as Dr. Smollett called him. In sheer gratitude, not only did Fielding, as has been related earlier, make him physician to all the people who fall ill in “*Amelia*”; he again recommended him to the public in “*The Covent-Garden Journal*,” wherein he is extolled for his character and for his skill. In a suit brought by Thompson against an apothecary for slanderous words, it is said there, a gentleman declared on oath before the Chief Justice of England “that out of near fifty persons for whom he had known the Doctor to prescribe, not one

\* “*The General Advertiser*,” Dec. 28, 1749.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

had failed while under his hands.”\* Fielding’s trust in the advice of this ignorant man was most unfortunate. The cure effected by the quack proved to be quite illusory.

On his feet once more, Fielding plunged into work with greater zest than ever. He wrote a novel, he wrote pamphlets, he conducted a newspaper, he issued proposals for a translation of Lucian directly from the Greek, he drafted measures for the Pelham Ministry, he reorganized the metropolitan police, and presided over the principal police court of Middlesex. When Hurd met him in March of 1751, he was only a shadow of his former self. A life of dissipation and a life such as Fielding lived, though quite different, end in the same way. As other moralists sometimes do, Hurd discovered vices where there were none as an easy explanation of physical wreckage. Despite the inroads of gout and its train of evils, Fielding still went on in the old way, not yet apprehending the imminent danger. When he dedicated “*Amelia*” to Ralph Allen in December of the same year, he wrote as if he expected, in the natural term of man’s life, to survive his friend. Neither bandaged legs, nor crutches, nor the invalid’s chair could break his spirit.

At this time Edward Moore, the young dramatist and journalist whom Fielding helped into happiness and fame, saw much of him. In a letter, unfortunately without date, Moore wrote to John Ward, a dissenting minister of Taunton, with reference to an introduction to Fielding. As planned, the three were to pass an evening together in Moore’s rooms; but the meeting had to be postponed on account of Fielding’s illness. Informing Ward how matters stand, Moore says:

“It is not owing to forgetfulness that you have not heard from me before. Fielding continues to be visited for his sins so as to be wheeled about from room to room; when

\* “*The Covent-Garden Journal*,” April 18, 1752.

## LAST ILLNESS

he mends I am sure to see him at my lodgings ; and you may depend upon timely notice. What fine things are Wit and Beauty, if a Man could be temperate with one, or a Woman chaste with the other ! But he that will confine his acquaintance to the sober and the modest will generally find himself among the dull and the ugly. If this remark of mine should be thought to shoulder itself in without an introduction you will be pleased to note that Fielding is a Wit ; that his disorder is the Gout, and intemperance the cause.\*\*\*

If due allowance be made for the fact that one dissenter is here writing to another, this is doubtless a fair portrait of the convivial Fielding in his physical decline. In the language of formal piety, jocosely employed by a pious gentleman in addressing one still more pious, Fielding was a man overtaken by his sins. He might teach temperate habits, but he could not pursue them for long. If Fielding ever spent an evening with these Pharisees, we may be sure that they outranked him.

With this patient Dr. Thompson had clearly failed. Perhaps Fielding had lost confidence in his claims ; for he ceased to praise him and he took him out of "Amelia." From the quack he turned to an old remedy for the gout, then known in England as the Duke of Portland's Powder, because it had been recommended by the Duke of Portland. This preparation, to be had at the apothecary's, consisted of birthwort, gentian, germander tops and leaves, ground pine, and centaury, dried, powdered and sifted. It was supposed to be a formula of Galen's. Beginning in the summer of 1752, Fielding took the celebrated powder for a year ; during which time all the symptoms of his gout disappeared, though he did not regain his former vigour. These were rather strenuous months. He kept up for a time "The Covent-Garden Journal," elaborated his plan

\* Miss Godden, "Henry Fielding," pp. 214-215.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

for the improvement of the poor, and became involved in the perplexities of the Canning Case. The newspapers tell of a raid which he made with his constables in March, 1753, at four o'clock in the morning, on a masquerade where highwaymen were suspected to be. The justice compelled all present to unmask; but he discovered no highwaymen among them, for these gentlemen, being informed of their danger, had quietly slipped away.\* He had come, he says in the noble paragraphs closing his “Provision for the Poor,” to take a calm and philosophic view of what the future might have in store for him. He there aptly quoted a passage from the ode which Horace addressed to Thaliarchus, whom some trouble had overtaken in an inclement winter such as then held London in its grip—

Quem sors dierum cunque dabit, luero  
Appone . . .

and he added with equal aptness a line from the same poet’s epistle to Tibullus—

Grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora.

These two precepts, comprising, he says, his “great master’s advice,” he had endeavoured to reduce into a habit of life. Still, strive as hard as he might, he was unable quite to dispel the gloom; for he felt that the approach of death could not be long delayed. If his enemies should see in his project for a Middlesex hospital a scheme to build a fine house in which he himself might live, he would remind them that such a design would be contrary to his master’s express injunction; that it would be in truth—

Struere domos immemor sepulchri.

“Those who do not know me,” he concludes, “may believe this; but those who do, will hardly be so deceived by that cheerfulness which was always natural to me; and which,

\* As quoted in “The Gentleman’s Magazine,” March, 1753, XXIII, 145.

## LAST ILLNESS

I thank God, my conscience doth not reprove me for, to imagine that I am not sensible of my declining constitution. In real truth, if my plan be embraced, I shall be very easily recompenced for my trouble, without any concern in the execution. Ambition or avarice can no longer raise a hope, or dictate any scheme to me, who have no farther design than to pass my short remainder of life in some degree of ease, and barely to preserve my family from being the objects of any such laws as I have here proposed."

The ablest medical advice Fielding ever received came from Dr. Ranby. Circumstances, however, prevented him from following it. The symptoms of the gout, despite the Duke of Portland's medicine, all reappeared in August, 1753. Ranby then advised him "to go immediately to Bath" for the waters and rest. Accordingly, on that very night Fielding wrote to Mrs. Bowden of Bath to engage suitable lodgings for him. But a few days later, just as he was preparing to set out on his journey, though fatigued almost to death by five murder cases brought before him during the week, he received a summons from the Duke of Newcastle for a conference on the suppression of robbery and murder in the metropolis. Being then very lame, Fielding felt unable to wait upon the Duke, whose house was at some distance in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and he frankly so informed Mr. Carrington the messenger. The next morning came a more urgent summons; with which Fielding at once complied, though he was completely exhausted and in great pain from his gout. In truth, there was nothing else for him to do without offending his Grace; for a summons was a command. On Fielding's arrival at Newcastle House, the Duke treated him abominably. He let him wait for him some time in an ante-room; and then, instead of a personal interview, sent a gentleman to tell the justice what was expected of him. The demand that Fielding should rid the town of murder was almost as prepos-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

terous as would have been a demand that he eradicate from human nature original sin.

Fielding, nevertheless, concentrated all his faculties on the problem, and in four or five days submitted a plan to the Duke, which, though it failed to put a final end to murder, did prove, as has been related, adequate for the time being. All through the ensuing winter, the public suffered, the newspapers said, fewer outrages than had happened in any winter for twenty years. After his famous plan was adopted by the Privy Council, Fielding had to remain in town through the autumn to see that it was carried out. At first it was misunderstood by those in power as well as by the general public. There still exists in the author's own hand the rough draft of a memorial\* which Fielding addressed to the Duke of Newcastle in favour of seven special constables who had been deprived of the rewards to which they were entitled, on the ground that they were only thief-takers. By the time Fielding had accomplished his purpose, he was so weak and exhausted that he could not endure a journey to Bath—"a ride of six miles only," he says, "being attended with an intolerable fatigue." A cold which he caught in going to Newcastle House resulted in jaundice; asthma attacked him; and dropsy developed in his legs and abdomen. All these diseases, he adds, united "their forces in the destruction of a body so entirely emaciated, that it had lost all its muscular flesh." Fully aware of what he had done, Fielding became a voluntary sacrifice to the good of the public, in the hope that his name would be honoured and that, out of gratitude for his services, some moderate provision would be made for a family which he was leaving behind him.

The trip to Bath out of the question, Fielding went, just before Christmas, a short distance into the country, where

\* Two pages, folio. Sold by Sotheby, Feb. 25, 1918.

## LAST ILLNESS

he remained until the middle of February. It was an exceedingly cold winter, which put an end to "numbers of aged and infirm valetudinarians"; and Fielding himself became so depressed that he almost wished that he might die also. Those dismal weeks he probably spent, though he does not expressly say so, at Fordhook on the Uxbridge Road near Ealing. Nothing but death itself could keep him from labour. When he laid aside the editorial pen which had amused the readers of "*The Covent-Garden Journal*," he intimated that he might employ it in revising his former works. As a literary artist he doubtless wished to leave his novels as nearly perfect as might be; as a man whose affairs, he says, were in a desperate state, he hoped to gain a fresh sale for his books through revision. The nearer the end approached, the more his mind dwelt upon the sad fortunes which awaited his wife and children. He had already revised "*Amelia*" in anticipation of a day which never came when Millar would be ready to enter into an agreement for another edition of that novel, cured of all its faults. There was, however, still to be considered "*Jonathan Wild*," which had never quite had a chance to bid for popular favour. No London reprint of it had appeared since its inclusion in the "*Miscellanies*." In those expensive volumes it lay buried, though perhaps it might be purchased by itself without taking the rest of the set. The plan now was to publish the novel separately in a duodecimo volume which could be sold for three shillings. In this form, "*The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great*" was brought out by Millar on March 19, 1754.\* It was described on the title-page and in the newspapers as "*A New Edition with considerable Corrections and Additions*." An "*Advertisement from the Publisher to the Reader*," prepared by Fielding himself, whimsically warned all unversed in the black art not to search for an allegory where perhaps there was none; and

\* "*The Whitehall Evening Post*," March 16-19, 1754.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

a leaf, printed on both sides, displayed, with a few others, the books of Fielding and his sister with which Millar could still supply the public. This revision of “*Jonathan Wild*” in furtherance of a design to add to his income was, I take it, the work that engaged Fielding’s attention during his absence from London.

How thoroughly he performed the task has been shown in a chapter on the “*Miscellanies*,”—how he cancelled two chapters which time had rendered obsolete, how he blunted in many cases the satire on Walpole by the substitution of “*Statesman*” for “*Prime Minister*,” and how he adjusted the phrasing in general to the new times. The lapse of a decade had taken the edge from the author’s hostility to the *Administration* of Walpole long since dead. Moreover, Fielding was no longer in the Opposition. Henry Pelham, the head of the Ministry, was a personal friend, whose policies he had defended since the *Jacobite* insurrection. Accordingly, the old parallel between the careers of *Jonathan Wild* and a *Prime Minister* had lost its point. It must now become a parallel between a *thief-taker* and a great statesman of former times. The result was, of course, not a new “*Jonathan Wild*” but one that almost appears to have been written in 1753 instead of 1743 or earlier. If the novel lost much of its political character by this change of atmosphere, it gained enormously as a piece of social satire—universal in scope—on which time can inflict no further ravages. And let it be remembered that when Fielding made over “*Jonathan Wild*” for posterity, he was, in the opinion of all men, near the point of death.

A new book also came from the Fielding household at this time. It is “*The Cry: a New Dramatic Fable*,” in three volumes, which Dodsley brought out during the same month in which the revised “*Jonathan Wild*” appeared. It was written by Sarah Fielding in collaboration with Jane Collier and perhaps her sister Margaret also. Such evi-

## LAST ILLNESS

dence as we have indicates that the Collier sisters had lived more or less with the family for several years. At times they seem to have depended upon Fielding for their support. They were, it will be remembered, daughters of Arthur Collier, the philosopher and divine of Salisbury, who died in 1732, leaving his family in poverty. One of his sisters, then dead also, had married in her youth Richard Hele,\* the schoolmaster of the Cathedral Close who supplied some traits for the portrait of Roger Thwackum in "Tom Jones." The spinsters who wrote "The Cry" had educated themselves in Fielding's library. The books, ancient and modern, which they most quote were all on his shelves. They reproduced, too, many of his ideas, and they tried to imitate his style. They sometimes refer to "Tom Jones" or "Joseph Andrews," and often tell their readers what "an ingenious author"—meaning Fielding—has somewhere remarked. For Fielding they say the last word before his death in defence of Parson Adams against "the malicious rather than ignorant absurdities" which they have heard vented on the character. As a voice from the Fielding household, the passage is worth quoting. After observing that many readers fail to interpret Don Quixote aright, they proceed:

"Nor less understood is the character of parson *Adams* in *Joseph Andrews* by those persons, who, fixing their thoughts on the hounds trailing the bacon in his pocket (with some oddnesses in his behaviour, and peculiarities in his dress) think proper to overlook the noble simplicity of his mind, with the other innumerable beauties in his character; which, to those who can understand *the word to the wise*, are placed in the most conspicuous view.

"That the ridiculers of parson *Adams* are designed to be the proper objects of ridicule (and not that innocent man

\* Robert Benson, "Memoirs of the Rev. Arthur Collier," 1837, pp. x and 210 ff.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

himself) is a truth which the author hath in many places set in the most glaring light. And lest his meaning should be perversely misunderstood, he hath fully displayed his own sentiments on that head, by writing a whole scene,\* in which such laughers are properly treated, and their characters truly depicted. But those who think continual laughter, or rather sneering, to be one of the necessary ingredients of life, need not be at the trouble of travelling out of their depths to find objects of their merriment: they may spare themselves the pains of going abroad after food for scorn; as they may be bless'd with a plenteous harvest ever mature and fit for reaping on their own estates, without being beholden to any of their neighbours.”†

The sprightly hand that held the pen here perhaps belonged to Jane Collier, the author of “*The Art of Ingeniously Tormenting*.” Taken as a whole “*The Cry*” is a curious production, composed of a series of dramatic scenes divided into five parts. A prologue introduces each part, and an epilogue concludes the whole. With a novel so artificial in its design as this Fielding could have had little or nothing to do, although it was intended as a variant on his own procedure in “*Tom Jones*.” It is, however, not improbable that he assisted in some of the prologues. But the outstanding fact is that while he was revising “*Jonathan Wild*,” his sister and Jane Collier, possibly with the aid of Margaret, were completing their novel. They were all, I daresay, at work in the same house at Ealing.

In Fielding’s absence, the affairs of the Bow Street court were managed by his brother John and that able constable Saunders Welch. On these two men he relied for the relentless pursuit of robbery and murder. His constable was so successful in the part assigned to him that Fielding, apprehensive of death, thought the time had come to make

\* “*Joseph Andrews*,” Bk. III, Ch. VII.

† “*The Cry*,” III, 122-123.

## LAST ILLNESS

him a justice of the peace. To this end he wrote to the Lord Chancellor, his friend the Earl of Hardwicke:

“My Lord,

As I hear that a new Commission of the Peace is soon to pass the Great Seal for Westm<sup>r</sup> give me Leave to recommend the name of Saunders Welch; as well as to the next Commission for Midd'x. Your Lordship [will] I hope, do me the Honour of believing, I should not thus presume, unless I was well satisfied that the Merit of the Man would justifie my Presumption. For this besides a universal Good Character, and the many eminent services he hath done the Public, I appeal in particular to Master Lane; and shall only add, as I am positive the Truth is, that his Place can be filled with no other more acceptable to all the Gentlemen in the Commission, and indeed to the Public in general. I am with the highest Duty and Respect,

My Lord,

Your Lordship<sup>s</sup> most obedient and  
most humble servant,

HENRY FIELDING.

“Dec<sup>r</sup> 6. 1753

To the Lord High Chancellor.”\*

It was not Fielding’s desire that Saunders Welch, whom he and Thomas Lane, then a Master in Chancery, recommended to the Lord Chancellor, should be his successor. This position he reserved in his mind for John Fielding. Welch was to be John’s assistant, just as John had been his own in previous years. Together they were to administer justice on the efficient lines which he had established. In accordance with this plan, John Fielding took the oath as justice of the peace for the county of Middlesex at the general quarter sessions held at Hicks’s Hall on January 15, 1754. With the aid of the Duke of Bedford, he was able

\* British Museum, “Additional MSS.,” 35604, f. 127.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

to swear to the possession of “six houses in Lambs Conduit Passage in the parish of St. George the Martyr and one house in Monmouth Street in the parish of St. Giles in the Fields, being leasehold,” having altogether a clear yearly value of £100.\*

On his return to London, Fielding tried to imagine that he was somewhat better, but his friends shook their heads. Resuming his duties, he held out for a fortnight or more. To be exact, the newspapers record warrants and commitments in his name during the last ten days of February. Then the necessary treatment for his dropsy incapacitated him. He dismissed Dr. Thompson and summoned the notorious Dr. Ward, renowned for a pill and a drop, which, it was said, had cured as many people as they had killed. The quack was known as “Spot Ward,” because of a claret-coloured mark on his left cheek, or because his remedies were supposed to go direct to the spot they were intended to hit. He appears, surrounded with the emblems of death, in Hogarth’s “Consultation of Physicians” or “The Undertakers’ Arms,” and again in “The Harlot’s Progress,” where the patient dies while Dr. Ward and Dr. Misaubin are disputing. His nostrums, which were often “dissected and examined” by hostile members of the faculty, seem to have been compounded mainly of antimony and arsenic in quantities that rendered their free use very dangerous. And yet, as a general practitioner, Ward had his good points. He had treated many similar cases, and he would take no fee from Fielding. If he looked grave when he saw his new patient and wished that he had been called in earlier, he knew that there was but one thing to do.

By his advice, Fielding was tapped in the abdomen and relieved of fourteen quarts of water. “The sudden relaxa-

\* Record Office. “Middlesex Guild Hall. Oaths taken by Justices of the Peace, 1750-1763,” p. 59. Saunders Welch took a similar oath on April 9, 1755. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

## LAST ILLNESS

tion," says Fielding, "which this caused, added to my enervate, emaciated habit of body, so weakened me, that within two days I was thought to be falling into the agonies of death. I was at the worst on that memorable day when the public lost Mr. Pelham [March 6]. From that day I began slowly, as it were, to draw my feet out of the grave; till in two months time I had again acquired some little degree of strength; but was again full of water. During this whole time, I took Mr. Ward's medicines, which had seldom any perceptible operation. Those in particular of the diaphoretic kind, the working of which is thought to require a great strength of constitution to support, had so little effect on me, that Mr. Ward declared it was as vain to attempt sweating me as a deal board."

Through the month of April, while Dr. Ward was trying to sweat out the dropsy, Fielding occasionally took part in the criminal proceedings of his court. He received special praise for his share in breaking up a fresh gang of robbers and for bringing to the gallows a highwayman who had lately created a panic "in the polite part of the town." But towards the end of April his examinations and commitments came to an end. Early in May, he again submitted to the trocar. "I had," he says, "one quart of water less taken from me now than before; but I bore all the consequences of the operation much better. This I attributed greatly to a dose of laudanum prescribed by my surgeon. It first gave me the most delicious flow of spirits, and afterwards as comfortable a nap." About a week later, he retired to Fordhook. Fielding's days in the fetid air of a court room were now over; and his brother, who had been acting as the principal justice at Bow Street for five months, definitely took his place. In anticipation of Fielding's retirement, several newspapers expressed at the same time regret for his continued illness and satisfaction with the probable reconstruction of the Bow Street court. Of Field-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ing's effective method of dealing with violent crimes, it was said: "The whole plan, we are assured, is communicated to Justice John Fielding, and Mr. Welch, who are determined to bring it to that perfection of which it is capable; so that if the publick do not, by the most gross supineness, continue the evil, street robberies will soon be unknown in this town."\*\*

At Fordhook, Fielding did not materially improve. Ward's remedies having been discarded, he made a short trial of the milk diet advocated by Boerhaave, but that regimen, he says, did not agree with him. Of course it did not agree with him; a Fielding could not long subsist on milk with a little bread and a few vegetables. He then had recourse to the most widely known panacea of the eighteenth century. Many years before, he had read, out of curiosity, Bishop Berkeley's first letter on the virtues of tar-water and had kept a copy of the pamphlet ever since in his library. Tar, as one may see in Pliny, was a remedy sometimes used by the ancients; but water impregnated with tar was, according to Berkeley, a medicine discovered by the North American Indians. While living in Rhode Island the bishop heard of the cures effected by this tar-water, and afterwards put it to the test among the poor people of Cloyne during a severe winter when Ireland was visited by famine and disease. Berkeley never positively declared that tar-water was the universal medicine which philosophers believed to be existent somewhere in nature, but he apprehended that it might be such. His conjecture was interpreted by the public as a certain conclusion, and thousands of people—the sick and the well—began drinking tar-water. At the suggestion of Charlotte Lennox, "the inimitable and shamefully distress'd author of the *Female Quixote*," Fielding looked into the claims of the popular

\* "The Evening Advertiser," March 30-April 2, 1754.

## LAST ILLNESS

remedy; and found on rereading the bishop's treatise that it was good for the very diseases with which he was afflicted.

Compared with Ward's drop and pill, tar-water was a harmless drink. In accordance with Berkeley's prescription Fielding took half a pint of it every night and morning, with beneficial results, beyond his most sanguine hopes. His appetite increased and he grew stronger. Still, the acetic acid and creosote contained in tar-water could not stay the progress of his dropsy. Near the end of May he again submitted to the trocar. This time he endured the operation with little or no faintness, and only ten quarts of water were drawn from him. For these reasons he felt encouraged. Nevertheless, he began to fill again, and his asthma became more troublesome. On June 20, a London newspaper announced that Fielding was dead. In denying the report two days later, another newspaper assured the public that his health was "better than it had been for some months past."\*\* The truth is that, while the symptoms of his disease varied from day to day, the patient was really declining. "Indeed," says Fielding, "so ghastly was my countenance, that timorous women with child . . . abstained from my house, for fear of the ill consequences of looking at me."

It will be no surprise to those who know the indefatigable Fielding in contrast with the idle and self-indulgent gentleman of tradition, to be informed that he was employing such strength as still remained to him, in the most difficult piece of writing that he had ever undertaken. On the very day that Pelham died, David Mallet brought out the collected works of Henry Saint-John, Viscount Bolingbroke, the politician and deist. The coincidence was marked by Garrick in an ode having the clever stanza:

\* For the report and its denial, see "The Public Advertiser," June 22, 1754.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

The same sad morn to Church and State  
(So for our sins 'twas fixed by fate)

A double shock was given :  
Black as the regions of the north,  
St. John's fell genius issued forth,  
And Pelham's fled to heaven !

Bolingbroke's insidious attack in many essays on the Christian religion threw the clergy—both Anglican and nonconformist—into consternation. They denounced him in the newspapers, in pamphlets, and in longer treatises. To them and to the public at large, Bolingbroke was the arch-atheist, a blasphemer and hypocrite, who like all godless men recanted during his last illness and met death with abject fear of the torments in store for him. The philosopher did indeed suffer intense pain in the days preceding his death, but it came from a cancer in his face, not from his conscience. He did indeed remark, when he bade farewell to Chesterfield, "God who placed me here will do what He pleases with me hereafter, and He knows best what to do"; but this was no recantation, for Bolingbroke was never an atheist; nor do his last words display any anxiety about the punishment that awaits him in another world. Fielding, disregardful of apocryphal tales, set out, as soon as he was able, to expose the fallacies of Bolingbroke's philosophy.

He went about the task with characteristic thoroughness. In the first place there were five folio volumes to look into, of which the last, containing the essays, had to be read with the minutest care; and then to buttress his arguments, he thought it necessary, according to Murphy, to go through "the Fathers and the most eminent writers of controversy." The circumstances in which he prosecuted these studies were described in "The Evening Advertiser" for April 16-18, 1754. Though the paragraph writer doubtless over-drew the picture somewhat for effect, he expressed the

## LAST ILLNESS

general concern that Fielding might not live to complete the work upon which he was employed:

“It must always be remembered to the honour of Mr. Fielding, that, while he is sinking under a complicated load of dangerous disorders, and is so near the verge of eternity, that at night there is but little probability of his surviving to the next day; he devotes the whole strength of his faculties to the honour of God, and the virtue and happiness of the human soul, in detecting the pernicious errors of the late Lord Bolingbroke; who, as long as his memory shall be transmitted to posterity, must be considered as the disgrace of his country, and the enemy of mankind. That Mr. Fielding’s efforts, if the exertion of them is permitted to continue, will be attended with general success, there is great reason to expect; but the manner in which Lord Bolingbroke is said to have quitted life, will always be a more efficacious confutation of his principles, than can be produced by the confederated strength of human intellects.”

The long extracts which Fielding made from philosophers and divines for his answer to Bolingbroke were preserved, says Murphy in 1762, by his brother John. These papers have since disappeared; but so much of his refutation as he wrote out has survived. As published after the author’s death, under the title of “A Fragment of a Comment on Lord Bolingbroke’s Essays,” there are of it twenty-seven pages and a half. These show Fielding’s mind in his illness working smoothly and logically in a graceful and subdued style. They are pervaded with that philosophic wit and humour which Fielding had learned from South and Shaftesbury—which, we see from his confession in “The Covent-Garden Journal,” he had come to prefer to the wild play of Cervantes, or Lucian even. He lays down a few principles for his guidance and then proceeds to examine Bolingbroke’s essays one by one, bringing to the front his lordship’s contradictory assertions, and undermining his

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

philosophy by showing that his authorities said exactly the opposite of that which Bolingbroke declared they said. The method is subtle ridicule. His conclusion is that Bolingbroke was insincere in his opinions, that his lordship wrote but in jest. Becoming ironical, he finds “the noblest conservation of character” in this man who made “the temporal happiness, the civil liberties and properties of Europe” the game of his earliest youth, and could discover “no sport so adequate to the entertainment of his advanced age, as the eternal and final happiness of all mankind.”

Fielding did not get far in his examen of Bolingbroke’s essays, hardly beyond the first of them in the fifth volume. It was clearly his intention to complete the work while at Fordhook. But this design was upset by the necessity of leaving England. The physicians whom he consulted told him that his only chance of life was a long rest through the summer in order to gather strength against the ensuing winter. But there was no summer in England this year. A cold, wet spring had followed a severe winter. “In the whole month of May,” says Fielding, “the sun scarce appeared three times. So that the early fruits came to the fulness of their growth, and to some appearance of ripeness, without acquiring any real maturity; having wanted the heat of the sun to soften and meliorate their juices.” Likewise June came, and still summer lagged behind. If Fielding were to have the benefits of a warm season, it was now certain that he must go south in search of them. At first he thought of Aix in Provence; but consideration of this place was soon abandoned, for no ship was about to sail from London to Marseilles or to any other neighbouring port in the Mediterranean, and it was impossible for him to endure the journey overland, to say nothing of the expense of it. In the end he settled upon Lisbon, which was easy to reach owing to the large number of merchantmen

## LAST ILLNESS

engaged in the Portuguese trade. If winds were favourable, he might make the voyage in two weeks.\* At Lisbon, Fielding hoped to find the warmth he longed for, and to escape, by remaining there, the inclemency of another English winter.

\* "The Jacobite's Journal," March 19, 1748.

## CHAPTER XXVII

### A VOYAGE TO LISBON

One day, apparently the twelfth of June, his brother John sent him word that excellent accommodations might be obtained on “a ship that was obliged to sail for Lisbon in three days”; that is, on Saturday the fifteenth. The vessel, which lay by the London docks at Rotherhithe, was “The Queen of Portugal,” and the captain was Richard Veal (or Veale). Though the time was extremely short for making the necessary preparations, Fielding instructed his brother to engage passage for himself and those members of his family who were to accompany him, and thereupon began to set his affairs in order for the voyage “with the utmost expedition.” One of the first things to do was to make his will, if indeed he had not already made it since coming to Fordhook. The document, indicative of haste, for it bears no date, reads as follows:

“In the Name of God Amen—I Henry Fielding of the parish of Ealing in the County of Middlesex do hereby give and bequeath unto Ralph Allen of Prior Park in the County of Somerset Esq<sup>r</sup> and to his heirs executors administrators and assigns for ever to the use of the said Ralph his heirs &c all my Estate real and personal wheresoever and whatsoever and do appoint him sole Executor of this my last Will—Beseeching him that the whole (except my shares in the Register Office) may be sold and forthwith converted into Money and Annuities purchased thereout for the lives of my dear Wife Mary and my daughters Harriet and Sophia and what proportions my said Executor shall please

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

to reserve to my sons William and Allen shall be paid them severally as they shall attain the age of twenty and three And as for my Shares in the Register or Universal Register Office I give ten thereof to my aforesaid Wife seven to my Daughter Harriet and three to my daughter Sophia my wife to be put in immediate possession of her shares and my Daughters of theirs as they shall severally arrive at the Age of 21 the immediate Profits to be then likewise paid to my two Daughters by my Executor who is desired to retain the same in his Hands until that time—Witness my Hand—Henry Fielding—Signed and acknowledged as his last Will and Testament by the within named Testator in the presence of—Margaret Collier—Rich<sup>d</sup> Boor—Isabella Ash”\*

Eleanor Harriot (or Harriet) was the only surviving child of Fielding’s first marriage. Though no registry of her birth or baptism has yet come to light, she was probably sixteen or seventeen years old. William had passed his sixth birthday in February; and Sophia was midway in her fifth year. Allen, named from Fielding’s friend, was a mere infant, having been baptized at St. Paul’s, Covent Garden, on April 6, 1754. The prospective birth of this child explains Fielding’s great concern for the future of his family. Four children and a wife were the hostages that he must entrust to fortune and Ralph Allen.

More leeway than at first expected was given him to arrange for his departure. Captain Veal several times postponed the date of sailing in the interest of a full cargo. Indeed, Fielding invited him out to Fordhook for dinner a full week after the day that the captain had first set to weigh anchor. The interval enabled Fielding to work out all details for a long absence. Richard Boor, one of the

\* Miss Godden, “Henry Fielding,” p. 308. This will, discovered in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury by Mr. G. A. Aitken, was first published in “The Athenaeum,” Feb. 1, 1890.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

witnesses to the will, was to look after the little farm at Fordhook. There were harvests to gather, and pigs to be slaughtered. This Boor, who lived near Fielding, appears to have been a sort of bailiff or steward of small degree. Of the children, all but Harriot were to be left behind in charge of Mrs. Daniel, their grandmother. Besides Fielding and his wife and oldest daughter, the party was to consist of Margaret Collier, going as a companion to Harriot and Mrs. Fielding, of his wife's maid, Isabella Ash, and of a footman named William. For conveying these six passengers safely to Lisbon, Fielding agreed to pay Captain Veal thirty pounds.

The date eventually fixed upon for embarking was Wednesday, June 26. "On this day," says Fielding, "the most melancholy sun I had ever beheld arose, and found me awake at my house at Fordhook. By the light of this sun, I was, in my own opinion, last to behold and take leave of some of those creatures on whom I doated with a mother-like fondness, guided by nature and passion, and uncured and unhardened by all the doctrine of that philosophical school where I had learnt to bear pains and to despise death." All that morning—from four o'clock onward—he spent with those children whom he scarcely hoped ever to see again. Nature, he admits, played the woman with him and made him suffer during the eight hours passed in their company more than during the entire period of his illness.

Precisely at noon, he was helped into a coach, followed by his wife who bore herself "like a heroine and philosopher, tho' at the same time the tenderest mother in the world." Then entered his eldest daughter and the rest of the party. Friends gathered round to wish him a *bon voyage*. Two of them—Jane Collier and Saunders Welch—accompanied him on the twelve miles' journey to "The Queen of Portugal" lying off Rotherhithe. If he followed his plan, he took a wherry near the Tower. As he was in

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

a perfectly helpless condition, it was necessary to carry him into the boat, and afterwards to hoist him aboard ship in a chair lifted with pulleys. These transfers were skilfully managed by Saunders Welch amid the jests and jeers of sailors and watermen, which awakened in Fielding some indignation, but more sorrow for the cruelty and inhumanity inherent in the nature of man. Besides himself there was a great quantity of personal luggage to be taken aboard. Moreover, though by the terms of the contract, Captain Veal was required to sustain his passengers during the voyage, it was whispered to Fielding that the table would be provided with no luxuries unless he went down further into his own pocket. Taking the hint, he supplied the ship's stores with a large hamper of wine, a quantity of hams and tongues, a coop of live chickens, and several sheep—mostly, it seems, from his farm at Fordhook. Nor did he forget his books. How many of them he took from his shelves, we do not know; but in the selection which he made were one or more volumes of that splendid folio edition of Plato, in Greek and Latin, which Stephanus brought out at Paris in 1578. He took with him also his *collectanea* for the refutation of Lord Bolingbroke; for he had not yet given over the completion of that congenial labour. Bolingbroke was merely laid aside for the lighter task of keeping a journal during the voyage to Lisbon—a most intimate log-book with reflections, from which I have quoted and on which will rest most of the remaining narrative of the voyage.

The captain, despite solemn promises, had no intention of sailing the next morning after his passengers went aboard. He slept on land that night, and delayed in the hope of additions to his cargo. For more than three days the ship still lay at anchor between Wapping and Rotherhithe—between two shores which resounded with bawling fishwives and vociferous sailors and watermen. Nor were

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the odours wafted across the Thames those from “Araby the Blest.” Other passengers mentioned by Fielding were an illiterate Portuguese friar who knew no language but his own, and a rude schoolboy of fourteen on his way to meet his father in Lisbon. The cabin was small and the meals were ill dressed. Withal the dropsy was becoming burdensome. Accordingly on Friday, Fielding sent for his friend William Hunter, “the great surgeon and anatomist of Covent-garden,” who had probably used the trocar on him before. This time ten quarts of water were removed, and the patient felt at ease in his great arm-chair on deck. A few hours later his wife came down with a violent tooth-ache lasting several days, and her husband forgot his own serious condition in his sympathy with her excruciating pain, which no surgeon could relieve. There were also hot altercations between Fielding and the captain; after which the traveller decided to submit, for the present, to the master of the ship, though a “tyrant” and a “bashaw.”

This man Fielding closely studied as he had studied other queer people in real life for his novels. What he had heard of Captain Veal, what he saw of him, and what he learned from conversations with him, he combined into a rare portrait, the main features of which began to appear in the records of the voyage covering the days before the ship left her moorings. “He had been,” says Fielding, “the captain of a privateer, which he chose to call being in the king’s service; and thence derived a right of hoisting the military ornament of a cockade over the button of his hat. He likewise wore a sword of no ordinary length by his side, with which he swaggered in his cabin, among the wretches his passengers, whom he had stowed in cupboards on each side. He was a person of a very singular character. He had taken it into his head that he was a gentleman, from those very reasons that proved he was not one; and to shew himself a fine gentleman, by a behaviour which seemed

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

to insinuate he had never seen one. He was, moreover, a man of gallantry; at the age of seventy he had the finicalness of Sir Courtly Nice, with the roughness of Surly; and while he was deaf himself, had a voice capable of deafening all others.” Of his seventy years, forty-six had been spent on the sea, and more than thirty of them in command of his own vessel.

Notwithstanding his arrogance, Captain Veal was a brave and experienced seaman. Though strict in his discipline, he was humane in dealing with his men, and he showed a tender heart towards all dumb animals—his cats and his kittens. He loved his ship as if she were his wife, and his boats as if they were his children. “He spoke,” in one of his conversations with Fielding, “of a ship which he had commanded formerly, and which was long since no more, which he had called the Princess of Brasil, as a widower of a deceased wife. This ship, after having followed the honest business of carrying goods and passengers for hire many years, did at last take to evil courses and turn privateer, in which service, to use his own words, she received many dreadful wounds, which he himself had felt, as if they had been his own.” But when he was in his cups, his conduct became outrageous. If the winds were contrary, he defied them, though in vain. If it blew a gale, he cursed the storm. His life he regarded as an unending contest between himself and the witches that ruled the sea with their spells.

One misfortune in the captain’s career Fielding failed to mention. Sometime in October, 1745, we may read, an English privateer, called “The Inspector,” sailed with a full crew out of the river Thames on its mission of piracy. She had twenty-two carriage guns besides swivels. Her commander was “Richard Veale.” By ill luck, the good ship was wrecked on the fourth of the next January in Tangier Bay off the coast of Barbary. Those of the crew

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

who escaped drowning—eighty-odd of them—were taken prisoners and driven inland to Fez to become the slaves of the Emperor of Morocco. His majesty, Muley Abdullah, set them to the useless labour of building up and pulling down castle walls from sunrise to sunset for seven days in the week. He gave them little to eat but bread and water, and supplied them with no shelter. After various negotiations, the captives were redeemed by the British Government in December, 1750, and a few months later they were brought to Portsmouth on a man-of-war. Some of them, however, had made their escape in the autumn of 1748 and had safely reached London via Gibraltar. Others who attempted flight at the time had their heads cut off. Among those who succeeded in the desperate encounter with their guards, was Captain Veal, for we find him the next year in command of “The Queen of Portugal” bringing into port from Lisbon a treasure of thirty thousand Spanish dollars for the merchants of London.\* Why Fielding never referred to this Moroccan episode is an enigma. Did he regard it as too generally known? or had he never heard of it?

The old pirate, who had hitherto made promises only to break them, unexpectedly weighed anchor on Sunday morning, June 30; and “The Queen of Portugal” floated with wind and tide down to Gravesend. As the ship passed Deptford and Woolwich, Fielding was profoundly stirred by the noble sights which he saw there. In the docks were the great ships on which Britain depended for her supremacy over the sea; and riding at anchor were several Indiamen just returned from their voyage, and whole fleets of smaller vessels engaged in the American, African, and

\* “The St. James’s Evening Post,” July 22-23, 1749. On the ill-starred “Inspector” and her crew, see Thomas Troughton’s “Barbarian Cruelty,” 1751; “The Ladies Magazine,” for 1750-1751, II, 143, 206, 219, 222, 238, 254, 268, 302; and “The Gentleman’s Magazine,” for 1748, XVIII, 413, 482, 531; also XIX, 3; and XXI, 282, 382.

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

European trades. As these symbols of the British Empire lay all spread out before him, he felt beyond his wont the exaltation of the patriot. A subdued tone, however, pervaded his emotions. Invincible as was his country's rule of the sea, her armies, he reflected, were unequal to the French or the German in excellence and splendour. His equanimity, too, was disturbed by a needless accident to the ship; and he regretted that his wife, still confined to her cabin with the toothache, could not share with him the gaiety of the scene on the river. His troubles, however, were borne easily under the inspiration of a bright morning, and a succession of agreeable objects which met his eye all the way to Gravesend, where the captain cast anchor.

After dinner the next day, Saunders Welch and Jane Collier, who had remained with the party until this time, took their leave and returned to London by post-chaise. Just after they left, Fielding had a sharp encounter with two custom-house officers, one of whom he rebuked for appearing in the presence of Mrs. Fielding without removing his hat. The gentleman was compelled to beg the lady's pardon before he could transact any business with her husband. Towards six in the evening, the captain once more weighed anchor and fell down to the Nore for the night. The passage thither, says Fielding, "was extremely pleasant, the evening being very delightful, the moon just past the full, and both wind and tide favourable." The next morning they again set sail, and skirted along the shore of Kent until three o'clock in the afternoon, when the wind turned squarely against them, and they were forced to anchor in the Downs, two miles off Deal. That evening his wife fell asleep, exhausted by the pain of her tooth, which a surgeon, summoned from Deal, had failed to draw; his daughter and Margaret Collier retired seasick to bed; and Fielding was left to himself without a companion. To pass one's time alone for an hour or two would seem to be no great hard-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ship; but Fielding when not at work was never contented unless there was someone to converse with. In desperation, he invited the deaf captain to sit down with him to a small bowl of punch, over which they both fell fast asleep. Thus ended the first day in the Downs. This may not have been the best way for a man afflicted with the gout to conclude a lonely evening; but in the circumstances there was no other way for Henry Fielding.

For more than five days, "The Queen of Portugal" was held near Deal by contrary winds. This was from Tuesday evening, July 2, to Monday morning, July 8. Most of the time, the ship rolled about there in a tempestuous sea, to the great inconvenience of all on board. Twice the captain hoisted sail, only to return, after vain attempts to beat against the wind, to his former station. Fielding sent his man ashore for fresh vegetables, and dispatched a letter, apparently lost, to his brother John. The ladies suffered so much from seasickness that he felt justified in asking the captain of a man-of-war, lying at Deal, to conduct the entire party in a long-boat to Dover, some seven miles away. The request, made on Friday, was discourteously denied, though Fielding intimated in his letter to the captain that the favour would be appreciated by "the wife of the first lord commissioner of the admiralty." This "great lady's name" which Fielding presumed to use in his distress, was Lady Elizabeth Yorke, the daughter of his friend Lord Hardwicke; in 1748 she had become the wife of that Lord Anson who made a famous voyage round the world, taking untold treasures from the Spaniards. By Sunday the wind abated, and they all entered into the sport of fishing for whitings. But for the miserable days thus ending pleasantly in the Downs, we should never have had "The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon." As Fielding had nothing else to do, he then first seriously thought of such a book, and it is most probable that he then and there began its

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

composition. Thereafter, we may see him occasionally at his work. "Some of the most amusing pages, if indeed there be any which deserve that name," says Fielding, "were possibly the production of the most disagreeable hours which ever haunted the author."

At six o'clock on Monday morning, "The Queen of Portugal" left her station off Deal. The wind was not yet very auspicious, but the tide helped her along past Dover. Shakespeare's cliff to the west of the town, Fielding decided, owed its fame not at all to nature but to the genius of the poet and to what Mr. Addison had written of it. As viewed from the sea, the cliff failed to make Fielding dizzy, and he thought it would be much the same were he to look over the edge. Evening found the ship beating the sea off Sussex, in sight of Dungeness. The breeze died away, and the heavens, with scarcely a cloud, were all lighted up by a most brilliant moon. The same fine weather continued through Tuesday and Wednesday, followed by a fresh gale north-northwest, which brought the good ship on Thursday morning in sight of the Isle of Wight. Though the captain swore that he would keep the sea against the evil intentions of the wind, he was eventually forced to tack and stand in for the shore. At three o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, he came to anchor at Ryde, then a small village, on the north shore of the island.

In this safe harbour, the ship lay wind-bound for a full week—from Thursday, July 11, to Thursday, July 18. On Friday the ladies went ashore for tea at an alehouse, and Fielding made use of the opportunity to write the following letter to his brother. In a characteristic manner, he keeps in the background all the annoying incidents of the voyage. The letter runs:

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“On board the Queen of Portugal, Richd<sup>d</sup> Veal at anchor on the Mother Bank, off Ryde, to the care of the Post Master of Portsmouth—this is my Date and yr Direction.

July 12 1754

“Dear Jack, After receiving that agreeable Lre\* from Mess<sup>rs</sup> Fielding & C<sup>o</sup>, we weighed on monday morning and sailed from Deal to the Westward Four Days long but inconceivably pleasant passage brought us yesterday to an Anchor on the Mother Bank, on the Back of the Isle of Wight, where we had last Night in Safety the Pleasure of hearing the Winds roar over our Heads in as violent a Tempest as I have known, and where my only Consideration were the Fears which must possess any Friend of ours (if there is happily any such), who really makes our Wellbeing the Object of his Concern especially if such Friend should be totally inexperienced in Sea Affairs. I therefore beg that on the Day you receive this Mrs Daniel may know that we are just risen from Breakfast in Health and Spirits this twelfth Instant at 9 in the morning. Our Voyage hath proved fruitful in Adventures all which being to be written in the Book you must postpone yr Curiosity. As the Incidents which fall under yr Cognizance will possibly be consigned to Oblivion, do give them to us as they pass. Tell yr Neighbour I am much obliged to him for recommending me to the care of a most able and experienced Seaman to whom other Captains seem to pay such Deference that they attend and watch his Motions, and think themselves only safe when they act under his Direction and Example. Our Ship in Truth seems to give Laws on the Water with as much Authority and Superiority as you Dispense Laws to the Public and Examples to yr Brethren in Commission. Please to direct yr Answer to me on Board as in the Date,

\* Livre.

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

if gone to be returned, and then send it by the Post and  
Pacquet to Lisbon to -

Y<sup>r</sup> affect<sup>t</sup> Brother  
H. FIELDING

“To John Fielding Esq. at his House in  
“Bow Street Cov. Garden London.”\*

The next day, Saturday, July 13, the ladies, who disliked the ship, persuaded Fielding that it would be a good plan for him to go ashore with them and remain there until a shift in the wind should permit them to sail. The problem which confronted captain, passengers, and crew was a safe conveyance for a man who could not walk. They all saw that it would be difficult to transfer him to one of the ship's rather small boats, and then to carry him over the long mud-flat which intervenes between the water and the shore at Ryde. While they were devising various schemes to this end, fortune came to their aid by sending them that afternoon a large hoy, almost as big as a ship, which drew up by the side of “The Queen of Portugal.” On the deck of the vessel lay a buck, or half of one, which had been procured for Fielding from the mainland. The invalid was placed aboard the hoy, from which he was afterwards hoisted into a small boat in order that he might be rowed as near as possible to the edge of the flat. Thence two sailors carried him through the mud to dry land and a quarter of a mile up the hillside to “a house, which seemed to bid the fairest for hospitality of any in Ryde.” The mop of the landlady, however, in anticipation of her guests, had rendered the main room of the inn so damp that they chose her barn for their dinner. “This was,” says Fielding, “a dry, warm, oaken floored barn, lined on both sides with wheaten straw, and opening at one end into a green field, and a beautiful prospect.” There the cloth was laid.


\* From the autograph formerly owned by Mr. Frederick Locker-Lampson, as quoted by Miss Godden, “Henry Fielding,” 295-296.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

The little company, after consuming the beans and bacon which they had brought from the ship, ordered soles, whittings, and lobsters from a fisherman, with which, declares the dying man, “we completed the best, the pleasantest, and the merriest meal, with more appetite, more real, solid luxury, and more festivity, than was ever seen in an entertainment at White’s.” That night the happy Fielding slept in an apartment of the inn built from the materials of some ship long ago wrecked upon those shores. He imagined the room to be all that was left of an ancient temple dedicated to Neptune in honour of the blessing which the inhabitants had received from that defunct god of the sea.

Fielding’s account of what he saw at Ryde is filled with interesting local colour. He had traversed the island, he implies, on some previous visit; but no more delightful view ever met his eye than the one at Ryde, “extending to the sea, and taking in Portsmouth, Spithead, and St. Helen’s.” A fleet of ships, such as he observed riding at anchor in the roadstead, he thought “the noblest object which the art of man hath ever produced.” The parish then contained, he says, some thirty houses scattered along the hillside, many of them shaded with “large and flourishing elms” which formed natural groves, avenues, and lanes. Everywhere the verdure was extraordinary; and yet the soil, being gravel on a gentle slope, was so dry “that immediately after the most violent rain, a fine lady may walk without wetting her silken shoes.” In one of the fields, a quarter of a mile up the hill, stood a little chapel overlooking the sea. It had been built in 1719 by Thomas Player, who then owned the manor of Ryde, on a piece of free land called Picket Close, and it was dedicated to St. Thomas.\* Thither the ladies, “more from curiosity than religion,” repaired for divine service on Sunday morning, under the escort of

\* “The Victoria History of Hampshire,” ed. by W. Page, 1912, V, 178. The chapel is shown in the illustration facing this page.



VIEW OF RYDE, IN THE ISLE OF WIGHT.



## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

“the captain in a most military attire, with his cockade in his hat, and his sword by his side.” The ladies were disconcerted by the stares they received from the curate and the congregation, but the captain preserved his composure. The old beau, though Fielding did not yet suspect it, was trying to make an impression on the youthful heart of Miss Ash.

During that Sunday the characters of the innkeeper and his wife began to disclose themselves. This worthy couple, who bore the name of Francis, were near their grand climacteric and had lived in the house for forty years. In temper they were the direct opposite of each other. Mr. Francis was a mild man of a round, smiling face, without any opinions of his own on any subject whatever. Under the direction of his wife he looked after the farm, and left wholly to her the management of the inn. Mrs. Francis was a perfect shrew. “She was,” says Fielding, “a short, squat woman; her head was closely joined to her shoulders, where it was fixed somewhat awry; every feature of her countenance was sharp and pointed; her face was furrowed with the small-pox; and her complexion, which seemed to be able to turn milk to curds, not a little resembled in colour such milk as had already undergone that operation. She appeared indeed to have many symptoms of a deep jaundice in her look; but the strength and firmness of her voice overbalanced them all; . . . Though vocal be usually put in opposition to instrumental music; I question whether this might not be thought to partake of the nature of both; for she played on two instruments, which she seemed to keep for no other use from morning till night; these were two maids, or rather scolding-stocks, who, I suppose, by some means or other, earned their board, and she gave them their lodging gratis, or for no other service than to keep her lungs in constant exercise.” Her house was ill furnished; she had little with which to supply her guests,

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

and for that little she charged exorbitantly. From her the Fieldings obtained poor bread, poorer beer, the worst sort of tea, a spirit resembling rum for their punch, and an occasional bottle of the native wine denominated *wind*, which it was impossible to drink. Though Fielding resented her impositions which increased day by day, he would have few or no words with her. He silenced her tongue by settling the bill whatever it might be. In this wretched house, where he paid for what he did not get, Fielding regaled himself with his own tea, his own claret, his own venison, and with fruits and vegetables presented to him by a lady living near Ryde.

The name of this Lady Bountiful, Fielding kept to himself. He describes her estate, says she was a widow, and comments on her generosity. There he stops. His description of her seat, which he must have seen at some time, is embroidered with an interesting account of how her husband had acquired it. Here in full is the curious piece of local history which someone told him, if indeed he did not know a part of it already:

“At about two miles distant from this parish, lives that polite and good lady to whose kindness we were so much obliged. It is placed on a hill, whose bottom is washed by the sea, and which, from its eminence at top, commands a view of great part of the island, as well as it does that of the opposite shore. This house was formerly built by one Boyce, who, from a blacksmith at Gosport, became possessed, by great success in smuggling, of 40000 l. With part of this he purchased an estate here, and by chance, probably, fixed on this spot for building a large house. Perhaps the convenience of carrying on his business, to which it is so well adapted, might dictate the situation to him. We can hardly, at least, attribute it to the same taste with which he furnished his house, or at least his library, by sending an order to a bookseller in London, to pack him up 500

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

pound's worth of his handsomest books. They tell here several almost incredible stories of the ignorance, the folly, and the pride which this poor man and his wife discovered during the short continuance of his prosperity; for he did not long escape the sharp eyes of the revenue-solicitors, and was by extents from the Court of Exchequer, soon reduced below his original state, to that of confinement in the Fleet. All his effects were sold, and among the rest his books by an auction at Portsmouth, for a very small price; for the bookseller was now discovered to have been perfectly a master of his trade, and relying on Mr. Boyce's finding little time to read, had sent him not only the most lasting wares of his shop, but duplicates of the same, under different titles.

“His estate and house were purchased by a gentleman of these parts, whose widow now enjoys them, and who hath improved them, particularly her gardens, with so elegant a taste, that the painter who would assist his imagination in the composition of a most exquisite landschape, or the poet, who would describe an earthly paradise, could nowhere furnish themselves with a richer pattern.”

One afternoon the ladies and the captain visited her seat; “with the beauties of which,” says Fielding, “they declared themselves most highly charmed at their return, as well as with the goodness of the lady of the mansion, who had slipt out of the way, that my wife and her company might refresh themselves with the flowers and fruits with which her garden abounded.” The next afternoon the lady of the mansion called at the inn and left her compliments with Mrs. Francis for the party, with the assurance that they were most welcome to anything her house or garden afforded while they remained wind-bound. The following morning they sent a servant out to thank her for her extreme goodness. “He soon returned, in company with the gardener, both richly laden with almost every particular

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

which a garden at this most fruitful season of the year produces." Again, when the little company were preparing to leave Ryde, the family tea-chest, though afterwards discovered, could nowhere be found. Thrown into consternation by the apparent loss of "this sovereign cordial," they appealed to the generous lady, who sent them a whole canister of tea—quite enough for a voyage twice as long as that to Lisbon.

Thus ended for Fielding the pleasant episode with the lady of the island. After his death, however, Margaret Collier and Sarah Fielding stayed for a time at Ryde, whence they dispatched letters to their friend Samuel Richardson. Probably Jane Collier was with them also. The poor spinsters were drawn thither by the cheapness of living there and, no doubt, by the desire to be near a woman whose charities were bounded only by her means. What concerns us here of a very sad tale of poverty, destitution almost, is the fact that Miss Collier, in her letters of 1755-1756, discloses the name of Fielding's admirer. She was a Mrs. Roberts\*—perhaps the Miss Ann Reeves who in 1719 married Marmaduke Roberts, a gentleman of Gosport.† Her seat was at Appley, a mile to the east of Ryde. Some fifteen or twenty years before, the estate, consisting of two hundred acres, had come into the Roberts family in the manner related by Fielding.‡ The old smuggler, who formerly concealed his goods in the cellars of the house, was David Boyce, or Bryce. In the accounts of his exploits, the name is given both ways, due to a twist of the tongue or a twist of the printer. He died a miserable death in 1740.§ Much as Fielding describes it, the smuggler

\* Barbauld, "Correspondence of Richardson," II, 72-112.

† "Hampshire Allegations for Marriage Licenses" in the Publications of the Harleian Society.

‡ "Victoria History of Hampshire," ed. by W. Page, 1912, V, 192.

§ W. H. D. Adams, "The Isle of Wight," 1882, p. 176; and "Black's Picturesque Guide to the Isle of Wight," 1873, p. 66. For engravings of

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

had built his house near the top of a gentle ascent, which commanded a full view of Ryde, the surrounding country, and the sea beyond a shore skirted with trees. In any description, Fielding was always careful about distance. From his inn to Appley along the shore and up the hill it was, as he says, a walk of nearly two miles. When Miss Collier was staying at Ryde in the autumn of 1755, Mrs. Roberts visited her mean lodgings, lent her books from her own library, and took her under the hospitable roof of Appley. Her winters Mrs. Roberts passed in London with "her amiable daughters." She accordingly knew of Fielding the Bow-Street justice, had read his novels, and seen his comedies on the stage every season. It may be that she was personally acquainted with Fielding, and was but repaying some specific act of courtesy when she provided him with the fruits of her garden.

Late Thursday morning, July 18, Fielding and his companions went aboard ship, and on a windless evening drifted a few miles down to St. Helen's, where they anchored. As they passed Spithead, they saw two regiments of soldiers just returned from Gibraltar and Minorca. In one of them Captain Veal had a nephew, a young lieutenant, who paid his uncle Richard a visit the next day. He posed as a merry fellow, always laughing before he spoke as well as at everything he said, although there was no jest in it. He slapped his uncle on the back, exclaiming "D—n me, Dick," and otherwise treated the old man with gross familiarity. His smartness pleased the captain but bored Fielding, who expressed relief when the wind, springing up towards evening on Friday, compelled the coxcomb to go ashore. That night a brisk wind from the north swept "The Queen of Portugal" away by the back

Appley House, see W. Cook, "A New Picture of the Isle of Wight," Southampton, 1813, p. 72; and G. Brannon, "Views . . . in the Isle of Wight," Southampton, new ed., 1825, plate 20.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

of the Isle of Wight and on by Christchurch and Peverell Point. By noon on Saturday she was off the Isle of Portland, "famous for the smallness and sweetness of its mutton." In the evening and the following night the wind blew "a perfect hurricane"; the captain lost his bearings and became alarmed for his ship; while Fielding, in no fear of death if it must come, sat quietly in the cabin. At six o'clock the next morning Berry Head was sighted; and within half an hour "The Queen of Portugal" lay safe at anchor in Tor Bay, on the southeast coast of Devon. Though Fielding does not give the name of the harbour, it was clearly Brixham, where William of Orange landed when he came to deliver England from the Stuarts.

Owing to high or contrary winds, the ship was forced to remain there for six days—from Sunday morning, July 21, to Saturday morning, July 27. The incidents of those days Fielding describes with many details. All that time he stayed on shipboard, looking towards the land which he had known and especially loved since boyhood. A few miles distant was Lyme Regis, where in his youth he had tried to run away with Miss Andrew the heiress. When the Earl of Cromarty, after the insurrection of 1745, was banished to Devonshire, Fielding remarked in "The Jacobite's Journal" that to live in this paradise of the West was no banishment; and he now repeated his former comment while lying within a mile or two of the shore. The first thing he did was to send his man into the country to purchase three hogsheads of cider from Mr. Giles Leverance of "Cheeshurst"—probably Churston Ferrers—on the coast near Dartmouth. One of the hogsheads he was to take with him to Lisbon; while the other two were to be sent as a present to his friends in London—his brother John, Saunders Welch, Andrew Millar, and Dr. William Hunter. He thought that they would relish this pure juice of the apple from "the garden of Devonshire" much more

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

than the mingled juice of apples and turnips sold in Middlesex for cider. When he had finished the transaction, he wrote his brother John the following letter about the purchase and about Richard Boor's mismanagement of Fordhook:

“Torr Bay, July 22, 1754.

“Dear Jack, Soon after I had concluded my Letter of Business to Welch yesterday, we came to an Anchor in this Place, which our Capt says is the best Harbour in the World. I soon remembered the Country and that it was in the midst of the South Hams a Place famous for Cyder and I think the best in England, in great Preference to that of Herefordshire. Now as I recollect that you are a Lover of this Liquor when mixed with a Proper Number of Midd<sup>x</sup> Turneps, as you are of Port Wind well mixed likewise, I thought you might for the Sake of Variety be pleased with once tasting what is pure and genuine, I have therefore purchased and paid for 2 Hdds of this Cyder where they will be delivered in double Casks to y<sup>r</sup> Order transmitted by any Master of a Coasting Vessel that comes from London to these Parts. You must send the very Paper inclosed that being the token of the Delivery. The Freight of both by a Coaster of Devon or Cornwall will be 8 shillings only, which is I believe y<sup>r</sup> whole Expence. They stand me within a few shillings at 4£, and the learned here are of Opinion they are the finest of their kind, one being of the rougher the other of the sweeter Taste. Welch will easily find almost every day one of these Coasters in London, which the Uncertainty of our Stay here and the Hurry which every Veering of the Wind puts us in prevents my providing here. It will be fit for drinking or bottling a Month after it hath lain in your Vault. I have consigned it in the following manner. Half a Hdd to yourself, half to Welch, half to Hunter and half to Millar, and I wish you all merry over it.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“In your last, there is only one Paragraph which I wish better explained. *If Boor be trusty.* Pray let me know any Shadow of a Doubt: for the very Supposition gives me much Uneasiness. If he is not trusty he is a Fool; but that is very possible for him to be, at least to catch at a lesser, and dishonest Profit, which is present and certain in Preference to what is in all Respects its Reverse. Pray give me as perfect Ease as you can in this Particular. I begin to despair of letting my House this Summer. I hope the Sale of my Wine may be more depended on: for the almost miraculous Dilatoriness of our Voyage tho it hath added something to the Pleasure, hath added much more to the Expence of it. In so much that I wish Welch would send a 20£ Bill of Exche<sup>r</sup> by Perry<sup>s</sup> Means immediately after me; tho I fear Boor<sup>s</sup> Demands for Harvest Labourers have greatly emptied his Hands, and I would not for good Reasons be too much a Debtor to the best of Friends. I hope at the same time to see a particular Account of the State of Affairs at Fordhook, and the whole Sum of Payments to Boor from my leaving him to the Date of such Letter, when I presume the Harvest, as to England, will be pretty well over. I beg likewise an exact Account of the Price of Wheat p Load at Uxbridge. I have no more of Business to say, nor do I know what else to write you: for even the Winds with us afford no Variety. I got half a Buck from the New Forest, while we lay at the Isle of Wight, and the Pasty still sticks by us. We have here the finest of Fish, Turbot, vast soals and Whitings for less than you can eat Plaise in Mdd<sup>x</sup>. So that Lord Cromarty<sup>s</sup> Banishment from Scotland hither was somewhat less cruel than that of Ovid from Rome to Pontus. We may however say with him—*Quam vicina est ultima Terra mihi!* Ultima Terra is you know the Lands End which a ten Hours Gale from North or East will carry us to, and where y<sup>r</sup> Health

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

with all our Friends left behind us in England will be most cheerfully drunk by

Y<sup>r</sup> affect<sup>e</sup> Brother  
H. FIELDING.

“All our loves to my sister.”\*

If Fielding had ever known the taste of fish fresh from the water, he had forgotten it long before the voyage to Lisbon. Soles and whittings, which he mentions in this letter, had supplied his table at intervals since the delay in the Downs. These he thought excellent; but at Tor Bay, the next morning after he wrote to his brother, he purchased a *john dorée* weighing four pounds,—a kind of fish which, he was told, Sir Epicure Quin the actor had fed on while visiting these parts. Somewhat sceptical of his friend’s reputed praises, Fielding had but to taste to be convinced. No fish he had ever eaten possessed its delicate flavour. Not since the repast in the barn at Ryde had there been so merry a dinner as when Fielding sat down with his party in the cabin to their *dorée* and claret.

The glorious meal, however, concluded with some exciting scenes. While they were in the midst of it, Tom the captain’s steward, alias *valet de chambre*, abruptly entered and began, without begging pardon, to draw off a half-hogshead of small beer into bottles. Fielding politely requested the young man to wait until the dinner was over, but he was met with a flat refusal. Thereupon he picked up an empty bottle and threatened to throw it at the intruder’s head if he did not leave the cabin forthwith. The menace had the desired effect, though it put an end to the good cheer. At the time of the incident, the captain was dining with a brother captain on board another ship in the harbour. Being informed by Tom of what had happened,

\* The letter as printed by Austin Dobson in “*The National Review*,” Aug., 1911, pp. 985-986; and in “*At Prior Park*,” 1912, pp. 132-135. From the autograph formerly in the possession of the late Mr. George Fielding.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Captain Veal, somewhat elevated with champagne, at once returned to his ship and poured upon Fielding's head a torrent of abuse and blasphemy. Fielding, becoming very excited, decided to go ashore, obtain a warrant for the captain's arrest, and so give up the voyage. With these intentions, he sent for a hoy to carry himself and family to Dartmouth; but as the boat approached the ship, Captain Veal, frightened at the mention of the law against him, ran into the cabin, tumbled on his knees before the man whom he had insulted, and implored his mercy. "I did not suffer," says Fielding, "a brave man and an old man, to remain a moment in this posture; but I immediately forgave him."

This angry encounter cleared the atmosphere. All on board became more friendly than before the altercation. Indeed, as if to atone for his own hasty temper, Fielding wrote down in his journal every good characteristic of the captain that he had observed—his skill as a mariner, his love for his ship and his men, his whimsical tenderness towards all things, animate and inanimate. As a precaution against further trouble with the dropsy, he summoned, on the recommendation of Captain Veal, a surgeon from a neighbouring parish, who proved to be as expert with the trocar as were his brethren in London. There were two quarts of water less than when Dr. Hunter last performed the operation; and the patient was hopeful that the dropsy would now disappear. The ship was still held wind-bound for another day—bewitched, the captain averred, by Mrs. Francis of Ryde, because Fielding had not spent enough at her house. The ladies went ashore with the captain, and were entertained by a gentleman whom Fielding, remembering his Homer, calls Axylus because of his hospitality—a name which he had given to a benevolent character in "The Covent-Garden Journal." The Axylus of Tor Bay lived by the water-side near Brixham in whose

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

harbour “The Queen of Portugal,” except for one attempt to sail without wind, had rested at anchor all these days. The travellers took advantage of the calm to lay in stores of bread and meat for the voyage and butter enough to supply them long after they should reach Lisbon. While the ladies were away on shore on Friday afternoon, Fielding, relieved of his dropsy, fell into “a sweet and comfortable nap” which lasted three hours. Never was there a man of happier temperament. All expressions of anxiety and pain here and elsewhere in the journal are for his wife and her companions. There are none for himself.

Early Saturday morning, July 27, Captain Veal weighed anchor, doubled Berry Head, and arrived off Dartmouth. There being but little breeze, it seemed as if he could get no further, and so he determined to put back to the place whence he came. But to the surprise of everybody, the wind soon declared loudly against this design, and “The Queen of Portugal” was driven merrily towards the west. All that morning Fielding was in high spirits. With his friends he sat on deck under perfect heavens, and watched his native land recede until he lost sight of it forever. By Sunday noon, they were, according to the captain’s reckoning, “thirty miles to the westward of Plymouth,” and by evening they were well beyond the Lizard. As the ladies all became seasick, Fielding passed, without complaint, a lonely day in meditation, broken only by prayers on deck, which were impressively read by a common sailor. At noon on Monday an observation showed that they were just entering the Bay of Biscay, where they were to experience for nearly five days the usual calms and storms followed by contrary winds which threatened to drive the ship across the Atlantic to Newfoundland. During the entire passage through the Bay, they sighted only one sail, which appeared to be a brig bound for a port of Galicia. At one time it seemed as if they, too, must try to make a port in order to

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

save themselves. While the sea was rising into mountains, the captain related to Fielding the story of his misadventures and hairbreadth escapes—enough to “frighten a very bold spirit from undertaking even the shortest voyage.” The day that Fielding most enjoyed closed with an evening when a dead calm sank down on the ship a few miles northward of Cape Finisterre. For the first time he then felt the approach of that warmth for which he had left England. It is a notable passage:

“But here, tho’ our voyage was retarded, we were entertained with a scene which as no one can behold without going to sea, so no one can form an idea of any thing equal to it on shore. We were seated on the deck, women and all, in the serenest evening that can be imagined. Not a single cloud presented itself to our view, and the sun himself was the only object which engrossed our whole attention. He did indeed set with a majesty which is incapable of description, with which while the horizon was yet blazing with glory, our eyes were called off to the opposite part to survey the moon, which was then at full, and which in rising presented us with the second object that this world hath offered to our vision. Compared to these the pageantry of theatres, or splendor of courts, are sights almost below the regard of children.

“We did not return from the deck till late in the evening: the weather being inexpressibly pleasant, and so warm, that even my old distemper perceived the alteration of the climate.”

Once out of the Bay of Biscay, the weather was serene and bright. Never were there pleasanter seas than while “The Queen of Portugal” skirted along the shore of Portugal, at the rate of four to seven knots an hour. On Sunday morning, August 4, the captain himself read the service on deck, making, says Fielding, “but one mistake.” In the second lesson of the day, he turned *Elias* into a *lion*.

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

This amusing slip of eye or tongue Fielding evidently thought an unconscious revelation of the old mariner's character. After prayers, the passengers were informed that they were far advanced in latitude 42°; and should suppose off Porte that evening if the wind continued. The next morning they were in latitude 40°; and at five o'clock in the afternoon, they came up with the Burlings (sailors' English for the Berlengas), the first land which they had distinctly seen since they left Devonshire. Fielding observed, as he passed by, that only three of these rocky islands show their heads above water, and remarked that the Portuguese maintained there a kind of garrison consisting of malefactors banished thither for a term because of various small offences. This admirable policy of the Portuguese reminded him of a similar custom related by Diodorus Siculus of the ancient Egyptians. "That wise people, to prevent the corruption of good manners by evil communication," the Greek historian is said to have written, "built a town on the Red Sea, whither they transported a great number of their criminals, having first set an indelible mark on them, to prevent their returning and mixing with the sober part of their citizens." Fielding's story about the Burlings, which he doubtless got from Captain Veal, is not very trustworthy in its details. According to the usual accounts, a garrison was kept on the largest island to prevent pirates from landing there for fresh water; but that the guard was composed wholly or largely of malefactors is most improbable. Likewise the anecdote of the Egyptians has never been discovered in Diodorus the Sicilian.

The next morning (Tuesday, August 6), "The Queen of Portugal" passed the Rock of Lisbon (the Cabo da Roca), and anchored at the mouth of the Tagus.\* While waiting

\* The chronology of "A Voyage to Lisbon" as originally given by Fielding is correct until it reaches Ryde; but from that point onward it becomes confused. When, after leaving the ship, Fielding resumed his journal at the inn

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

there for the tide to convey her to Lisbon, Fielding listened and observed. On the summit of the Rock of Lisbon, he was told, dwelt an English hermit, a very old man, "who was formerly master of a vessel trading to Lisbon; and, having changed his religion and his manners, the latter of which, at least, were none of the best, betook himself to this place, in order to do penance for his sins." This is an Englishman's way of saying that the old mariner had turned Roman Catholic and been received there into the beautiful monastery of the Hieronymites hewn out of the rock. This proselyte, adds Fielding, had been regarded with particular favour by the Queen Dowager—Maria Anna of Austria, widow of the late King John,—who was accustomed to say "that the saving one soul would repay all the endeavours of her life." As he surveyed the face of the country from the ship, he commented on the absence of large trees and on the dull appearance of the soil, which resembled, in contrast with the verdure of England, "an old brick kiln, or a field where the green-sward is pared up and set a-burning or rather a-smoaking, in little heaps, to manure the land." At noon "The Queen of Portugal" entered the Tagus under the guidance of a pilot, and came to anchor three miles below Lisbon, at Belem, famous for its great Hieronymite convent and the magnificent royal

there, he wrote down "Sunday, July 19," which is an impossible date, for the nineteenth of July fell upon a Friday. From the context it is clear that he should have written "Sunday, July 14." Having once made the mistake, he carried it on for a week, and thereafter dropped the day of the month altogether and simply put down the day of the week. Mr. Frederick S. Dickson was the first to discover Fielding's error, and to work out the correct chronology of the book. See his manuscript "Index to The Voyage to Lisbon" in the Yale library, and incidentally his article in "The Library," Jan., 1917, third series, VIII, 24-35. Fielding's own dates from the time his ship anchored off Deal until it left the Downs may be confirmed by the ship-news in "The Public Advertiser," July 5, 6, 9, 10. In the same newspaper for Aug. 29, it was announced that "The Queen of Portugal" arrived off Lisbon, just as Mr. Dickson had determined, on Aug. 6, 1754.

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

palace. Rather strangely, Fielding, whose ear must have been slow to catch foreign sounds, persisted to the last in writing “Bellisle” for Belem, pronounced Belain, the final syllable being a nasal. Nor was he always quite accurate in historical details. For the benefit of English readers, he remarks that Catharine of Aragon, the divorced wife of Henry the Eighth, lay buried in the convent at Belem, “one of the most beautiful piles of building in all Portugal.” This unfortunate woman was in fact buried in the abbey church at Peterborough. Evidently Fielding confounded her with Catharine of Braganza, widow of Charles the Second, whose tomb may be seen among those of the great dead—Camoens and Vasco da Gama—in the beautiful church of Santa Maria, forming a part of the extensive convent of Belem.

Though interested in what he heard and saw at Belem, Fielding was annoyed by the regulations to which the Portuguese subjected ships before permitting them to approach Lisbon. “The Queen of Portugal” was halted at Belem by a salute from the fortress, which meant that she must proceed no further until all ceremonies were complied with. First of all, the passengers were drawn up on deck for the inspection of the health-magistrate, “a person of great dignity.” Fielding begged to be excused from the ordeal because of his lameness, but his request was met with a prompt refusal. Then insolent and corrupt customs officers came on board, and took, unless properly bribed, all the snuff and tobacco they could find, at the same time stealing such small articles as they could lay their hands upon. All formalities eventually at an end, Captain Veal weighed anchor at midnight on Tuesday, and sailed up to Lisbon with the tide. It was, says Fielding, “a calm, and a moon-shiny night, which made the passage incredibly pleasant to the women, who remained three hours enjoying it, whilst I was left to the cooler transports of enjoying their

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

pleasures at second-hand.” Tired out, Fielding kept to the cabin.

In the morning (Wednesday, August 7) the city, of which Fielding had enjoyed a distant prospect from Belem, he now saw close at hand. His first impressions were not altogether favourable, though the sight was novel. He writes in his journal:

“Lisbon, before which we now lay at anchor, is said to be built on the same number of hills with old Rome; but these do not all appear to the water; on the contrary, one sees from thence one vast high hill and rock, with buildings arising above one another, and that in so steep and almost perpendicular a manner, that they all seem to have but one foundation.

“As the houses, convents, churches, &c. are large, and all built with white stone, they look very beautiful at a distance, but as you approach nearer, and find them to want every kind of ornament, all idea of beauty vanishes at once. While I was surveying the prospect of this city, which bears so little resemblance to any other that I have ever seen, a reflection occurred to me, that if a man was suddenly to be removed from Palmyra hither, and should take a view of no other city, in how glorious a light would the antient architecture appear to him? and what desolation and destruction of arts and sciences would he conclude had happened between the several aeras of these cities?”

At noon, Fielding sent his man ashore to engage, with the aid of the captain, a suitable place to dine and lodge that night and to procure a chaise to convey him to the inn. Three hours later, William returned with the information that “there was a new law lately made, that no passenger should set his foot on shore without a special order from the providore; and that he himself would have been sent to prison for disobeying it, had he not been protected as the servant of the captain.” It would be necessary, he said

## A VOYAGE TO LISBON

further, to wait some time for the permit as “it was then the providore’s hour of sleep, a time when no man, except the king himself, durst disturb him.” But like all good things, the providore’s nap came to an end, and Fielding was allowed to leave the ship. “About seven in the evening,” he writes, “I got into a chaise on shore, and was driven through the nastiest city in the world, tho’ at the same time one of the most populous, to a kind of coffee-house, which is very pleasantly situated on the brow of a hill, about a mile from the city, and hath a very fine prospect of the river Tajo from Lisbon to the sea.” It was just six weeks since he had been driven in an English chaise from Fordhook to London to embark on “The Queen of Portugal.” At that nameless inn, evidently in a western suburb of Old Lisbon, “we regaled ourselves,” he adds, “with a good supper, for which we were as well charged, as if the bill had been made on the Bath road, between Newbury and London.” As he overlooked the Tagus famed for its golden sands, he thought of those other golden sands which once greeted Aeneas with his shipwrecked crew in a Libyan harbour; and then in joyful mood, as if untouched by disease, he concluded his book and his voyage with an apt quotation from Horace ending the journey to Brundisium:

—hic finis chartaeque viaeque.

## CHAPTER XXVIII

### THE END OF LIFE

With the voyage to Lisbon, likewise nearly closes the story of Fielding's life. He may be clearly followed for only three or four weeks more, when he dispatched by a packet-boat a letter to his brother John filled with details concerning family affairs. It is a long ship-letter written apparently on several days, undated and mutilated. Parts of it, including a whole sheet, have been lost and other parts are almost if not quite illegible. When the letter came to light in 1911, Mr. Austin Dobson at once published the greater portion of it and summarized the more difficult passages.\* This is our last full view of Fielding. In continuation of his journal, as it were, the letter begins:

“I am willing to waste no Paper as you see, nor to put you to the Expence of a double Letter as I write by the Packet, by which I would have you write to me every Letter of Consequence, if it be a single Sheet of Paper only it will not cost the more for being full and perhaps you have not time even to fill one Sheet for as I take it the idlest Man in the World writes now to the busiest, and that too at the Expence of the latter.

“I have rec'd here two Letters from you and one from Welch. The money I have tho I was forced to discount the Note, it being drawn at 36 days Sight upon a Portugese who never doth anything for nothing. I believe as it was

\* “The National Review,” Aug., 1911. From the autograph left by the late Mr. George Fielding. Reprinted in “At Prior Park,” 1912, pp. 139-148. Certain passages omitted by Mr. Dobson have been placed in my hands by Mr. J. Paul de Castro.

## THE END OF LIFE

in Portugese neither you nor Welch knew this, and it was the Imposition of the Drawer in London. Your letter of Business I have not yet seen. Perhaps it is lost, as if it came by a Merchant Ship it easily may, for the Captains of these Ships pay no Regard to any but Merchants for which Reason I will have all my Goods even to the smallest Parcel consigned to John Stubbs Esqr (as I mentioned before, and hope will be done long before y<sup>o</sup> receive this) marked with the large red F.—Pardon Repetition for abundans Cautela non nocet, and tho I mentioned my orders, I did not give the Reason I believe either to y<sup>o</sup> or Welch, at least all my Reasons for these are Several but this is most worth y<sup>r</sup> Notice. The Truth is that Captains are all y<sup>e</sup> greatest Scoundrels in the World but Veale is the greatest of them all. This I did not find out till the Day before he sailed, which will explain many Things when you see him as perhaps you may for he is likewise a Madman, which I knew long before I reached Lisbon and he sailed a few Days ago. I shall not, after what I have said, think him worth my Notice, unless he should obiter fall in my Way.

“In answer to yours, if you cannot answer . . . yourself, I will assure you once for all I highly approve and thank you, as I am convinced I always shall when y<sup>o</sup> act for me. I desire therefore you will always exert unlimited Power on these Occasions.

“With regard to the principal Point, my Health, which I have not yet mentioned, I was tapped again (being the 5th time) at Torbay partly indeed by Way of Anticipation, the Day before we sailed wanting one of three Weeks since the Operation in the Thames. Nine Quarts of Water were now taken away, and possibly here I left the Dropsy, for I have heard nothing of it since and have at almost six Weeks Distance not a drop of Water in me to my Knowledge.

“In Short as we advanced to the South, it is incredible

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

how my Health advanced with it, and I have no Doubt but that I should have perfectly recovered my Health at this Day, had it not been obstructed by every possible Accident which Fortune could throw in my Way."

At this point, there is a break in the letter. But enough remains to let one see that among the accidents which Fielding charges against fortune was the illness of his whole family "except myself, Harriot, and Bell." This is a strange way of saying that his wife, Miss Collier, and his man fell ill. For himself Fielding felt no great concern, for nearly six weeks had elapsed since he was last tapped! William, it appears, had aggravated his malady "by drinking too much wine"; and in mortal terror of dying and being buried in a foreign land, had sailed home with Captain Veal. After expressing his contempt for "the miserable cowardly driveller," Fielding goes on:

"In the next Place I found myself in the dearest City in the World and in the dearest House in that City. I could not for my Soul live for less than 2 Moidores\* a day and saw myself likely to be left Pennyless 1000 miles from Home, where I had neither Acquaintance nor Credit among a Set of People who are tearing one another's Souls out for money and ready to deposite Millions with Security but not a Farthing without. In this Condition moreover I saw no Likelihood nor Possibility of changing my Position. The House I was in being the cheapest of the three in which I could get a Lodging with<sup>t</sup> being poisoned.

"Fortune now seemed to take Pity on me, and brought me by a strange Accident acquainted with one Mr. Stubbs, the greatest Merchant of this Place, and the greatest Corn factor in the World. He hath a little Kintor<sup>f</sup> or Villa at a Place called Jonkera,<sup>f</sup> 2 miles from Lisbon and near Bellisle<sup>§</sup> which is the Kensington of England, and where

\* The moidore was equivalent to 27 shillings.

† Quinta.                    †Junqueira.                    §Belem.

## THE END OF LIFE

the Court now reside. Here he likewise got me a little House with<sup>t</sup> any manner of Furniture not even a Shelf or even a Kitchin Grate. For this I am to pay 9 Moidores a year, and hither I boldly came with scarce sufft Money to buy me the Necessar[ies] of Life. . . .”

Again, Mr. Dobson was compelled to give the substance of several paragraphs most difficult to make out. To quote his summary:

“In furnishing the ‘villakin,’ Fielding’s funds sank to the lowest ebb. But a well-timed bill arriving from his brother, the tables were turned, and his expenses became moderate.\* Instead of two moidores a day, he found he could live for less than a moidore per week, and with difficulty exceed it. ‘Where then,’ he asks, ‘was the Misfortune of all this? or what was there which could retard my Recovery, or shock a Philosophy so established as mine which had triumphed over the Terrors of Death when I thought it both certain and near.’ The answer is—that Mrs. Fielding, who, as we know, had fallen ill on landing, was still ailing in spirit. The climate of Portugal did not suit her: she was home-sick; and probably yearning for her little family at Fordhook. ‘She is,’ says Fielding, ‘I thank God recovered; but so dispirited that she cries and sighs all Day to return to England,’ where she believed her husband might complete his convalescence just as well as at Lisbon, since he could not there readily command a coach, or see after his children and his home. This, to Fielding, who felt himself daily growing stronger, was most disquieting; and far more wearing than it would have been to a more selfish or less warm-hearted man. Matters, moreover, were further complicated by the proceedings of that ambiguous ‘another’ (the word is Fielding’s own), who, either as com-

\* Fielding’s words are: “When I was thus settled my Money being all gone even to tapping the last 36s Piece I received your Bill with which I discharged all Debts and about nine Moidores remained in my Pocket.”

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

panion or confidante, plays so disturbing a part in many domestic difficulties. She is not named; but she must, we fear, be identified with Margaret Collier. She was poor; she was pushing and clever; she had become a 'Toast of Lisbon'; and she was apparently steadily setting her cap at the English Resident, one Williamson, a friend of Andrew Millar. Probably knowing that if Fielding went home with his wife and daughter she also would have to accompany them, she seems to have originated the insidious suggestion that Mrs. Fielding should go back alone; and that she (Miss Collier) should remain behind in charge, as companion to Harriot. One can easily imagine the intense vexation that, as hope revived and the pressure of necessity decreased, these unpalatable propositions must have caused to Fielding. 'By these means,' he says, 'my Spirits which were at the Top of the House are thrown down into the Cellar.'

"The passages immediately succeeding deal with plans for defeating Miss Collier's machinations. They show much excusable irritation—and even some incoherency. It is obvious, however, that Fielding has not the slightest intention of prejudicing his last chances of recovery by returning prematurely to England. One of the things he wishes his brother to do, is to send him out a 'conversible Man to be my companion in an Evening, with as much of the Qualifications of Learning, Sense, and Good humour as y<sup>o</sup> can find, who will drink a moderate Glass in an Evening or will at least sit with me till one when I do.' He does not know, he goes on, anybody more likely to grow better than himself; he has now vigour and elasticity in his limbs; gets easily in and out of a carriage; when in it, can ride the whole day; but all this will be lost if he goes back, or if the schemes of 'another' are allowed to prevail."

The letter contains references to presents for his friends at home. By Captain Veal had already gone half-chests

## THE END OF LIFE

of onions to his brother John, Mrs. Daniel, Millar, Welch, and Peter Taylor.\* For Millar and a Mr. Rose went also two half-hogsheads of calcavella. "I will," Fielding adds, "in November which is the right Season send you some Orange Trees as you desire, Lemons and some Wine, Port or Lisbon which you like best." In the meantime some other gift was to go to John by Captain Allen, "who sails next week." There was a present even for Dr. Arthur Collier, "who had an Execution," says Fielding, "taken out against me for 400£," and "whose very name I hate." In return Fielding gives directions to John with reference to his own comfort—clothing and provisions—for the winter. In anticipation of regaining the flesh lost by disease, he asks that his clothes be cut broader in the shoulders. Other articles he needs also, if he is properly to receive and return the visits expected of an English gentleman. Accordingly he writes:

"Let me have likewise my Tye and a new Mazer Perriwig from Southampton Street, and a new Hat large in the Brim from my Hatter, the corner of Arundel St. I have had a Visit from a Portugese Nobleman and shall be visited by all as soon as my Kintor is in order. Bell follows Capt Veale to England where he hath promised to marry her. My Family now consists of a black Slave and his Wife, to which I desire you to add a very good perfect Cook, by the first ship, but not by Veale. Scrape together all the Money of mine you can and do not pay a Farthing without my Orders. My Affairs will soon be in a fine Posture, for I can live here, and even make a Figure for almost nothing. In truth the Produce of the Country is preposterously cheap. I bought three Days ago a Lease [i.e. leash] of Partridges for abt 1.4 English and this Day 5 young Fowls for half a Crown. What is imported from abroad is ex-

\* "Peter Taylor of Bond Street, Esq." died April 27, 1757 ("The Gentleman's Magazine," 1757, p. 241).

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

travagantly dear, especially what comes from England as doth almost all the provision of Lisbon. I must have from Fordhook likewise 4 Hams a very fine Hog fatted as soon as may be and being cut into Flitches sent me likewise a young Hog made into Pork and salted and pickled in a Tub. A vast large Cheshire cheese and one of Stilton if to be had good and mild. I thank Welch for his, but he was cheated: God bless you and y<sup>rs</sup> H. Ffielding

mil annos &c."

A postscript, parts of which are missing, deals with his man and his wife's English maid. William, besides deserting his master, had proved to be dishonest. Instead of settling a bill for £3 12s., he kept the money in his own pocket and sailed away with it to England. This amount Boor must deduct from a draft of ten pounds which William will present for the payment of his wages, and thereupon strip him of his livery. On the other hand Fielding consigns Isabella Ash to his brother's compassion. The Universal Register Office should provide her with a new place, for she is "only a fool" deluded by Captain Veal.

Altogether this interesting letter depicts a household torn asunder. Mrs. Fielding may be excused for her homesickness, for she was ill, and all her children including her baby were in England. It was for her a trying situation. An infatuated maid, of course, was nothing more than an ordinary incident in all families; without Isabella Mrs. Fielding could get along with the aid of Harriot. On the other hand, William's conduct deserves unmeasured censure, for he left in the lurch a sick man dependent upon him for all the duties of a valet. The case of Margaret Collier is still worse, inasmuch as she should have had a higher sense of honour than a footman. Except for Fielding the spinster would have been compelled long ago to go out to service or to starve. Fielding befriended her, and took her under his own roof; and she afterwards repaid him, as we

## THE END OF LIFE

shall see, by insults to his memory. About her Mr. Williamson, however, Mr. Dobson was under some misapprehension. The man in question was the Rev. Dr. John Williamson,\* who became in 1748 chaplain to the British Factory at Lisbon. The next year he was elected to the Royal Society for his discoveries in mathematics. Fielding thought him “the cleverest fellow” he had ever seen, and made him his “chief companion.” Though Williamson “almost miraculously” survived the earthquake of 1754, he failed to marry Miss Collier, who rightly connected with Fielding her frustrated hopes of wedlock.

Irritated by these vexations, Fielding was nevertheless not dismayed. A wise man, he proceeded to set his house in order once more. In place of William and Isabella, he procured, we see, a black slave and his wife, and directed his brother to provide him with a cook and a decayed gentleman capable of intelligent conversation and a mild bowl of punch after supper. It is to be observed that Fielding, for obvious reasons, avoided Lisbon as a residence. If not “the nastiest city in the world,” it was the nastiest in Europe. Again and again it was visited by bubonic plague brought from the Orient. The little house which Stubbs obtained for Fielding at Junqueira was to the west of Alcántara, a suburb of villas and country houses pleasantly situated in full view of the Tagus. Among his near friends and neighbours were, besides Stubbs and Williamson, a “Mrs. Berthon and family,” and doubtless a much larger English colony. There he settled, on a year’s lease, with the determination to win back that health which he still averred had been lost in the service of his country. So far as the symptoms of his disease were concerned, he might well hope for a happy recovery. His dropsy had disappeared, he had regained the full use of his legs, and the

\* Mr. J. Paul de Castro, “Notes and Queries,” 11 S. XI, 251 (March 27, 1915); and Barbauld, “Correspondence of Richardson,” II, 94.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

jolting of a Lisbon chaise no longer tired him. As if he expected to live long, he asked his brother to send out a Mrs. Hedley as a housekeeper, and a Mr. Jones as an amanuensis.

At Junqueira, Fielding prepared for the press his “*Voyage to Lisbon*.” The journal proper, begun while “*The Queen of Portugal*” lay off Deal, had been written under the vivid impression of the incidents as they occurred. Within a few days after his arrival in Lisbon, this part of the book must have been complete. How closely Fielding, to use a phrase of Richardson, wrote “to the moment” is indicated by an entry under the Tuesday before he disembarked. He there, as we have related, comments on the zeal of “*the present queen dowager*” in making converts to Romanism. The Queen Dowager died on the Wednesday of the following week. Of this event, succeeded by a great state funeral, Fielding must have been aware; and yet he made no alteration in his manuscript in consequence of it; for to have done so would have been, from his artistic point of view, a positive error. The Queen Dowager was alive when he wrote the passage. It was, as will become manifest, John Fielding who afterwards substituted “*the late queen dowager*” for his brother’s words. Still, there remained to be written a preface and an introduction to the book before it could go to the printer. That both were composed in their proper order during the next weeks, there can be no doubt; for in the preface Fielding expressly says that he is writing in a land nowhere excelled for the “*pomp of bigotry*,” and in the introduction, descriptive of events preceding the voyage, he pleasantly refers to a rule laid down in the preface for the guidance of travel-writers.

The preface is a brief essay, not too serious, on the art of the traveller’s tale, quite analogous to the preface to “*Joseph Andrews*” on the art of the novel. In both cases Fielding explains his procedure and declares himself an

## THE END OF LIFE

innovator. He denounces the liars, who like Pliny fill "their pages with monsters which no body hath ever seen, and with adventures which never have nor could possibly have happened to them." Indeed, absurdities of this kind he had long ago burlesqued in the first edition of "Jonathan Wild." Even old Homer in the *Odyssey* was too much of a romancer to please Fielding. He preferred Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. Nearer his ideal of the voyage-writer were Burnet and Addison; but the former was perhaps more of "a political essayist" and the latter more of "a commentator on the classics" than one expects to find among travellers. My Lord Anson's "Voyage round the World" he thought unexcelled for truthfulness. That famous book, published only a few years before, he says playfully, is the only competitor of his own.

This delightful rambling foreshadows the conclusion that the voyage or the travel-sketch, like the novel, is but history illuminated by the imagination. In both genres, one of the aims is entertainment. Hence it is necessary at times to extend fact by fiction; but no incident must ever be admitted unless it has some foundation in what really occurred. This is a variation from exact truth always granted to the historian. "We are not to conceive," observes Fielding, "that the speeches in Livy, Sallust, or Thucydides, were literally spoken in the very words in which we now read them." Remove from these great historians their felicitous style, and the loss of pleasure to the reader would be immense. Still, hardly secondary to entertainment is instruction. Accordingly, a good voyage-writer moralizes upon events as they arise whenever he is certain that he can convey useful information. In every case good sense alone must determine when to give and when to withhold comment. As a rule, one should exclude all those trivial incidents which fill the letters of young gentlemen making the grand tour, such as the quality of the wine and the tobacco, for

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

example; and yet some occurrence of no great importance in itself may lead to a train of reflections at once amusing and instructive. A well-written voyage or journey, Fielding would thus imply, is a novel without a plot, and as such it approaches a step nearer contemporary history. The hero is the narrator, to whom, if he knows his business, he will properly subordinate his companions and everybody else whom he may meet. Around Fielding gyrate his family, Captain Veal with his nephew and steward, and the little company at Ryde besides many others. The most essential difference between the journey of a Tom Jones up to London and Fielding's own voyage to Lisbon lies in the fact that in the former case the author was hampered by anxious thought of a dénouement somewhere ahead, while in the latter case he was free to introduce any incidents he wished, certain that his own personality would lend to the narrative sufficient unity.

Fielding also felt at liberty to digress whenever he pleased. His digressions read like little essays such as he had written for his newspapers or like sections in his pamphlets. They are, however, never quite independent of the narrative; they are always evoked, in accordance with the principles laid down in his preface, by some immediate occurrence. Thus, when seeing the abundance of fish along the English coast, he cannot refrain from considering the fish monopoly in London and the best means of putting an end to it. He would hang, if necessary, the fishmongers in order that the poor may not starve. Again, he writes on British liberty or the rule of the mob as he views it in the insolence of watermen, and discusses at length obvious defects in the maritime laws of his country which the legislature might easily cure. He is at his best when relating some anecdote like that of the old rogue of the sea whom justice failed to get into her clutches.

The crux of all Fielding's observations is one which he

## THE END OF LIFE

made at his departure from Ryde concerning Sir Robert Walpole, the statesman whom he had pilloried in “The Champion” and “Jonathan Wild.” In memory of the prospect as he looked from Ryde over the sea towards the mainland and saw ships of all kinds passing or riding at anchor, he remarks: “When the late Sir Robert Walpole, one of the best of men and of ministers, used to equip us a yearly fleet at Spithead, his enemies of taste must have allowed that he, at least, treated the nation with a fine sight for their money.” The phrase “one of the best of men and of ministers” has been sometimes quoted to show that Fielding, just before death, recanted his lifelong opinion of Walpole. This is a misapprehension. The phrase, as may be seen from the sentences which follow it, was used in irony just like similar phrases in “Jonathan Wild.” Fielding always regarded Walpole as the head of a body of plunderers who deceived the people by shows like the one at Spithead every year.

Less attention has been paid to Fielding’s final comment on Richardson. Since his burlesque of “Pamela,” Fielding had several times commended the work of his sober rival, especially “Clarissa Harlowe.” Now in the concluding paragraphs of his preface to “A Voyage to Lisbon,” he returns to the man whose art he had praised not long before in “The Covent-Garden Journal.” If the reader, he says, finds “no sort of amusement in the book,” there may be derived from it large “public utility,” which in Mr. Richardson’s opinion should be the primary end of all romance, delight in the narrative being only incidental. If some saturnine critic is disposed to censure the humorous treatment of grave questions, he has also ready a reply. “I answer,” he says, “with the great man, whom I just now quoted, that my purpose is to convey instruction in the vehicle of entertainment; and so to bring about at once, like the revolution in the Rehearsal, a perfect reformation

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

of the laws relating to our maritime affairs: an undertaking, I will not say more modest, but surely more feasible, than that of reforming a whole people, by making use of a vehicular story, to wheel in among them worse manners than their own.” This retort to an imaginary gentleman is a loose parody of a paragraph in Richardson’s preface to “*Clarissa Harlowe*,” where the author declares that, however interesting his story may be, it should be considered mainly “as a vehicle to the instruction.” That the manners of Richardson’s characters were worse than those in real life was probably Fielding’s candid opinion.

The preface and introduction to “*A Voyage to Lisbon*” were the last words Fielding wrote for publication. In the very last sentence his mind was on his home at Fordhook. There were, however, subsequent letters to friends in London. In “*The Public Advertiser*” for October 16, 1754, we read:

“Letters by the last Mail from Lisbon advise that Henry Fielding, Esq. is surprisingly recovered since his Arrival in that Climate. His Gout has entirely left him, and his Appetite returned.”

Of these latest letters, only one besides the long ship-letter to his brother John has survived; and it is said to be of no importance.\*

Fielding’s career was now ended. There are signs that his condition since reaching Lisbon had been much more desperate than he apprehended. A reader must take with large allowance the story of improved health, for it comes from a man of the most sanguine temper. One who saw the manuscript of his journal speaks of “a hand trembling in almost its latest hour”; and as Mr. Dobson says, certain passages in his long letter from Lisbon show “some incoherency.” Family affairs vexed him, he lost his spirits, and perhaps became downright despondent with the waning

\* Mr. J. Paul de Castro, “*Notes and Queries*,” 11 S. X, 214 (Sept. 12, 1914).

## THE END OF LIFE

of nervous energy. The struggle could be kept up no longer. How it all happened, nobody knows. In cases like Fielding's, the immediate cause of death is sometimes cerebral hemorrhage; but in this particular instance we have perhaps a better clue in the words of his first biographer, who simply says "his strength was now quite exhausted." There was probably a gradual decline ending in painless death at Junqueira on October 8, 1754.\* The warmth of Portugal had been able to keep Fielding alive for but two months and a day. He was in his forty-eighth year.

Fielding was buried in the British cemetery at Lisbon, which had been laid out some forty years before by the British Factory in the northwest part of the town, probably not far from the house where he had spent his first night after leaving "The Queen of Portugal." The merchants chose for their dead a beautiful hillside, lower down which has since risen the great Basilica of the Heart of Jesus. Here lies Fielding's body near the centre of the cemetery having in Portuguese the name of *Os Cyprestes* because of the numerous cypresses which border the avenues. Everywhere the graves are shaded by laurel and other flowering shrubs. Everywhere scarlet geraniums grow in profusion. It is the home of the nightingale whose note may be heard in the thick foliage at noontide.

The place where Fielding's friends laid him to rest, beneath two overhanging cypresses, they marked with a stone of some kind. In after years, when they themselves were dead or were growing old in England, the grave was suffered by the English Factory to fall into complete neglect, to the surprise of an occasional pilgrim to the literary shrine. Nathaniel Wraxall, while staying in Lisbon in 1772, had difficulty in finding the grave at all, which, he says in his "Memoirs," was "nearly concealed by weeds

\* "The Public Advertiser," Oct. 28, 1754.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

and nettles.”\* He mentions a tombstone; but as he fails to describe it, we may conclude that it was only a plain slab containing nothing more than Fielding’s name with the date of his birth and burial. In 1795, another English traveller, James Cavanah Murphy the architect, observes that when he visited Lisbon, six or seven years before, the grave of “the celebrated Henry Fielding” was “without a monument, or any other obsequious mark of distinction, suitable to his great talents and virtues.” Murphy’s ambiguous phrases may mean either that there was then no stone by Fielding’s grave or merely none worthy of his genius. In view of Wraxall’s positive statement, we must infer that Murphy intended to convey the latter impression unless indeed a fallen stone had become so completely covered with overgrowth as to be invisible. In 1786, Murphy goes on to say, the French consul at Lisbon, the Chevalier de Saint-Marc de Meyrionet, offered to erect a monument to Fielding at his own expense. The memorial was no sooner prepared than it was refused admission into the cemetery on account of its “contemptible design” and “unappropriate and unpoetic” epitaph written in the French language. So Fielding’s French admirer had the monument placed in the cloisters of the old Franciscan Convent, now the home of the Bibliotheca Publica, where Murphy saw and condemned it. Four quatrains deplore the oblivion that has overtaken Fielding, with an implied rebuke to his countrymen for their indifference towards one of their own race whose work future ages will applaud.† Obviously no monument with such an inscription could be countenanced by the British colony.

A similar fruitless attempt was made to honour Fielding’s memory by John of Braganza, the Queen of Portugal’s uncle. This nobleman, as illustrious for his virtues

\* N. W. Wraxall, “Historical Memoirs,” 1836, I, 54.

† J. C. Murphy, “Travels in Portugal,” 1795, p. 173.

## THE END OF LIFE

as for his rank, thought it but an act of courtesy to rear a monument over the grave of a great writer who had died while a guest of his country. Of his project there has survived a Latin inscription prepared for him by the Abbé Correa da Serra, secretary to the Academy of Sciences at Lisbon, and afterwards Portuguese minister to the United States. The memorial was to have been dedicated, in the name of humanity, to Henry Fielding, an Englishman, whose ashes lay unhonoured until John of Braganza provided a monument in order that Portugal might not seem inhospitable to the Muses (*ne Musis inhospita haec tellus videretur*\*). Not the British Factory, but the Church, it is said, intervened. No Roman Catholic, however exalted his birth, could be allowed to pay so generous a compliment to a heretic. Alas, poor Fielding!

If Fielding was ever to have a monument it was now clear that it must be erected by his countrymen, whose reluctance to do justice to the author of "Tom Jones" amused as well as irritated both the French and the Portuguese. The first step was taken two or three years after the rejection of Meyrionet's memorial, when a member of the British colony requested an English artist, then in Portugal studying "the antiquities of that kingdom," to design an appropriate tomb. This unnamed artist was, without doubt, none other than James Cavanah Murphy who, as we have just seen, was at that time on a mission to Lisbon. Murphy's design, engraved by William Thomas, was put into circulation as a print in London and was published in "The European Magazine,"† with the hope that it would be observed by some generous admirer of Fielding. The appeal, however, met with no immediate response; and during the next quarter-century Fielding's grave became almost if not

\* "Notes and Queries," 8 S. IV, 164 (Aug. 26, 1893).

† June, 1793, XXIII, 408.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

quite obliterated, so that there were few or no distinct traces of it.

Such was the situation when towards 1830 funds were collected by the Rev. Christopher Neville, the British chaplain at Lisbon, for a dignified memorial somewhat on the lines of Murphy's design, and for the purchase of an adjoining plot of ground in order to give the monument a conspicuous setting. The tomb, standing near the place where Fielding was buried, was built upon solid masonry which should withstand the ravages of time for many centuries. A rectangular base (fourteen feet by eleven) supports an oblong block of stone, upon which rests a sarcophagus surmounted by an urn. It is all of marble, giving the effect of massiveness rather than beauty. On the side towards the west is the inscription:

MEMORIÆ SACRUM  
EXIMIUM PROMERENTIS HONOREM,  
IMPENSIS SUIS, OLYSSIPONE DEGENTES  
HOC MARMOR, HEU SATIS DIU NEGLECTUM,  
EXIGENDUM CURAVERE  
BRITANNI  
MDCCCXXX

(Sacred to the memory of one meriting distinguished honour, the British living in Lisbon have completed at their own expense this marble tomb, alas! too long delayed.)

On the southern face are the famous words:

FIELDING  
LUGET BRITANNIA GREMIO NON DARI  
FOVERE NATUM

(Britannia grieves that she is not permitted to fold her son within her own bosom.)

On the opposite face of the tomb are words not so well known:

# THE END OF LIFE

HENRICI FIELDING

A SOMERSETENSIBUS APUD GLASTONIAM ORIUNDI

VIRI SUMMO INGENIO

EN QUAE RESTANT:

STYLO QUO NON ALIUS UNQUAM

INTIMA QUI POTUIT CORDIS RESERARE MORES HOMINUM  
EXCOLENDOS SUSCEPIT.

VIRTUTI DECORUM, VITIO FOEDITATEM ASSERUIT, SUUM CUIQUE  
TRIBUENS;

NON QUIN IPSE SUBINDE IRRETIRETUR EVITANDIS.

ARDENS IN AMICITIA, IN MISERIA SUBLLEVANDA EFFUSUS,  
HILARIS, URBANUS ET CONJUX ET PATER ADAMATUS,  
ALIIS NON SIBI VIXIT.

VIXIT: SED MORTEM VICTRICEM VINCIT DUM NATURA  
DURAT DUM SAECULA CURRUNT.

NATURAE PROLEM SCRIPTIS PRAE SE FERENS  
SUAM ET SUAE GENTIS EXTENDET FAMAM.\*

The Rev. Christopher Neville's Latin, beginning well, then stumbling into impossible grammar, and finally recovering itself, may be paraphrased to read in English:

"Of Henry Fielding, sprung from the people of Somersetshire and born near Glastonbury, a man of the highest genius, behold all that remains! No other man so well unlocked with his pen the recesses of the heart, or with greater zeal undertook to improve the conduct and character of men. He showed virtue her grace, vice her deformity, giving to each her due, though he himself was at times enmeshed in follies which he ought to have avoided. Ardent in friendship, generous in relieving distress, of a cheerful temper, courteous and affable in bearing, beloved both as husband and father, he lived not for himself but for others. His mortal life is at an end, but he has won a victory over victorious death which will last as long as nature endures and the ages run their course. Displaying in his

\* "Notes and Queries," 8 S. IV, 314 (Oct. 14, 1893). The inscription, as usually given, contains one or more errors in transcription.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

works the offspring of nature, he will extend his own fame and the fame of his race."

Though far from a literal translation, this is what the Latin means to say. No one can fail to notice that some of the original phrases represent an endeavour to put into Latin Hamlet's advice to the players, where the prince declares that the purpose of the actor should be "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." The application of the famous passage to Fielding's art is as apt as it is striking. But as a lofty eulogy on the character of Fielding, the epitaph is marred by an unjust sentiment. That one line—*Non quin ipse subinde irretiretur evitandis* ("not but that he was himself sometimes ensnared by things he ought to have shunned")—places the inscription in the category of a funeral sermon over a genius whose vices the world must lament. Burns had as his biographer a physician who was a teetotaller. Fielding had as his eulogist in marble a parson whose occupation was to save sinners. It is uncertain whether Burns or Fielding was the more unfortunate.

This is "the cold tomb" that George Borrow kissed, and asked all other English travellers to kiss also, if they would pay due homage to "the most singular genius which their island ever produced."\*

Fielding never sat for his portrait, though Hogarth, it is said, often requested the favour, only to be put off by vague promises. There is a very fine picture by Hogarth, known as "The Green Room, Drury Lane," in which one of the seven persons has sometimes been taken for Fielding. The identification, however, can be but imaginary, for the group, composed of the living, was painted after Fielding's death.†

\* "Bible in Spain," Ch. I.

† Mr. J. Paul de Castro, "Notes and Queries," 12 S. III, 181 (March 10, 1917).

## THE END OF LIFE

Again, his figure appears at full length, as we have seen, in several political caricatures of the period. But these cartoons make little attempt to reproduce form and feature; they merely give a few peculiarities of dress and appearance, just sufficient to identify the man in the midst of others. They are not portraits; they are only remote likenesses. Nor was any cast of Fielding's face taken after death. Both Fielding and his family were indifferent to the curiosity of a public not yet born. Probably they never thought that far-distant readers of "Tom Jones" would be inquisitive to see the face of the man who wrote that book. They thus failed to enrich our literary annals with a portrait which would have had surpassing interest.

It sometimes happens that posterity is indebted to a bookseller for a portrait which they otherwise would not have. There is, for example, the anecdote concerning Smollett. When a bookseller, so the story goes, was preparing to bring out an edition of this novelist's works, he could find no portrait for a frontispiece, and so commissioned an engraver to make one. The engraver, having nothing else at hand, took a portrait of George Washington, reworked the features somewhat, and produced a Tobias Smollett. Though there are several authentic portraits of the Scot, the transformed George Washington has ever since passed current. The case is not so bad with Fielding. When Andrew Millar, with the assistance of Arthur Murphy, issued in 1762 the first collected edition of Fielding's works, he felt the same need of a portrait to adorn the first volume. Quite naturally, Hogarth was asked to supply the necessary adjunct. According to the usual account, Hogarth drew from memory a pen-and-ink sketch of Fielding's head while the painter's wife and another lady, Mrs. Mary Lewis, were sitting by. Two anecdotes about the incident were long in circulation. One of them is that Garrick, to aid Hogarth, impersonated Fielding, even putting on a suit of his

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

clothes, and thus sat for the painter in place of their old friend. This detail is preposterous; the only truth lying behind it is that Garrick urged Hogarth to make the portrait. The second anecdote was told by Murphy himself while Hogarth was still living. He says that a lady supplied the painter with a paper mask of Fielding's profile, which she had at some time cut out with a pair of scissors. It later transpired that this unnamed lady was Margaret Collier. The silhouette, such as she is said to have placed in Hogarth's hands, would of course have given him merely the dimensions and outlines of the face; but these measurements were very important. Though this anecdote like the other one is now commonly set down as an idle tale, it is, I think, in the main true. It seems probable that Margaret Collier had a silhouette of Fielding and gave it to Hogarth. This opinion is in agreement with the view taken by the late H. B. Wheatley, who remarked that "a portrait entirely from memory is scarcely likely to be a profile and the accentuation of the nose reminds one of a silhouette."\*\*

The portrait, giving head and bust, was engraved in facsimile by James Basire, already a master of his craft, though but a young man. So fine was the etching that Hogarth, it has been said, mistook a proof of the plate for his own drawing. One of these early proofs was published by John Ireland in the first edition of "Hogarth Illustrated" (1798), and has been occasionally reprinted since. It is the Fielding whom we all know in his wig, with massive shoulders and chest. The profile shows a prominent nose and less prominent chin; the brilliant, deep-set eye appears to be dark; and the receding upper lip indicates that loss

\* Besides Murphy, see John Nichols and George Steevens, "Biographical Anecdotes of Hogarth," third edition, 1785, pp. 385-386; "Genuine Works of Hogarth," 1817, III, 350; John Ireland, "Hogarth Illustrated," second edition, 1804, III, 283-284, 357; J. B. Nichols, "Anecdotes of Hogarth," 1833, pp. 269, 341, 399; Austin Dobson, "William Hogarth," 1900, p. 254; and H. B. Wheatley, "Hogarth's London," 1909, pp. 235 ff.

## THE END OF LIFE

of teeth of which Fielding often made a jest but never quite complained. Subsequent to the first sketch, Hogarth placed his portrait in an oval frame having the inscription “Henry Fielding, *Ætatis XLVIII.*”, beneath which rest on a table the symbols of Fielding’s fame in law and literature. When finished for Millar, it was a highly ornamental frontispiece in the best manner of the period.

Hogarth himself, however, set small value upon a portrait dependent for details upon memory. When he saw Basire’s engraving, he threw the original drawing into the fire, from which it was recovered in a scorched condition by Mrs. Lewis. It should now be in the possession of some collector. A tracing of Hogarth’s sketch on oil paper, supposed to be Basire’s in preparation for his engraving, was purchased long afterwards by Mr. George Barker of Birmingham, from whom it passed to George the Fourth for the Royal Collection. Some years ago, one of Basire’s first proofs, without the border and accessories, was discovered by Mr. W. F. Prideaux, who on first sight took it for the original drawing in pen-and-ink.\*

From Hogarth, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, have been derived through Basire all existing portraits of Fielding. Such, for example, is the one formerly in Ralph Allen’s collection at Prior Park, and now in the Royal Mineral Water Hospital at Bath. Basire’s engraving, after it had served for two editions of Fielding’s works, was faithfully reduced for the third edition (1766) by Isaac Taylor, the painter; and the next year a poor plate was executed by Thomas Phinn for an unauthorized edition that appeared in Edinburgh. A very pretty miniature, which was engraved by James Roberts for the author’s family, is now in possession of Mr. Ernest Fielding. It was first published, by permission of the novelist’s grand-daughter, Sophia Fielding, in Nichols’s “Literary Anecdotes of the

\* “Notes and Queries,” 7 S. VIII, 289 (Oct. 12, 1889).

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Eighteenth Century.”\* In this instance, the artist endeavoured to transform Hogarth’s Fielding into a much younger man. The result, though creditable, was not quite satisfactory. In 1883, a bust of Fielding was unveiled in the Shire Hall at Taunton, the county seat of Somersetshire. The sculptor, Miss Margaret Thomas, sought to bring into prominence the suggestion of ironic humour which one may perhaps see in the curling lip of the Hogarth portrait; but it was a mistake to try to do this in marble.

Of the many artists who have attempted to improve upon Hogarth should be mentioned Samuel Freeman, who engraved in 1840 the frontispiece to Thomas Roscoe’s edition of Fielding’s works. It is a sumptuous gentleman in velvet and lace, with strongly marked features which arrest the attention; but the drawing is rather crude. And yet, if anybody wishes to see how far removed from the original a portrait may be, he should rather look at the frontispiece engraved in 1811 by James Hopwood for the fourth volume of Mudford’s “British Novelists,” or at the one—Hopwood’s redrawn by Tucker—which adorns an edition of Fielding’s works published at Philadelphia in 1836. Either of these portraits would serve equally well for Smollett or Sterne. Both are freaks coming from Basire’s Hogarth through the intermediary of a fanciful engraving by a Frenchman named Cazenave.

For Fielding somewhat as he was, we must always return to Hogarth’s portrait, which those who knew the novelist pronounced “a faithful resemblance.”

\* “*Literary Aneedotes*,” 1812, III, 356.

## CHAPTER XXIX

### LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

#### I

Within a fortnight after the death of Fielding, his widow sailed for home with her daughter and Miss Collier. His will was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on November 14, 1754. Ralph Allen, to whose care Fielding left his family, renounced both the execution of the will and the administration of the goods of the deceased. As a matter of form, the same action was taken by Mrs. Fielding. After these preliminaries, John Fielding was appointed administrator of the estate and guardian of the children.\* There is no hint of the valuation then placed upon Fielding's estate; but we know that it was small. The author of "*Tom Jones*" had clearly failed to make the provision he wished for his family. Of his twenty shares in the Universal Register Office, ten were given to his wife, seven were to be held in trust for his daughter Harriot, and three for his daughter Sophia. All the rest of his property, real and personal, was to be sold and converted into money and annuities for his widow and daughters, except such sums as might be set apart for his two sons, William and Allen, until they attained the age of twenty-three.

Among Fielding's "goods and chattels," was that private library to which frequent reference has been made in this biography. No one familiar with Fielding's works need be told that he was widely read in law and in literature, ancient and modern; but until the discovery was made by Mr.

\* Miss Godden, "*Henry Fielding*," p. 309.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Austin Dobson,\* it had escaped notice that he possessed an extensive library of his own. Pursuant to the general tenor of Fielding's will, this library was sold by the administrator for the benefit of Mrs. Fielding and the children. The sale took place at the house of Samuel Baker, auctioneer, in York Street, Covent Garden, on four successive evenings beginning with Monday, February 10, 1755. The previous Thursday, Baker published, as an aid to prospective purchasers, a "Catalogue of the Entire and Valuable Library of Books of the late Henry Fielding, Esq.," and announced that the collection was open for the inspection of the public.† A copy of this catalogue, containing price entries, found its way to the British Museum,‡ where of the moderns Mr. Dobson was the first to see it. Undoubtedly the British Museum copy, the only one known to exist, was prepared by the auctioneer himself for the administrator. This annotated catalogue is a full record of the sale, except that the names of the purchasers are not usually given. As numbered, there are six hundred and fifty-three distinct entries; but several additional items were written in later, and a few errors occur. The list as corrected increases the number of entries to six hundred and sixty-four. The volumes that may be counted number one thousand two hundred and ninety-eight.§ Besides these there are five lots of pamphlets, "waste," and broken sets, which, on a conservative estimate, bring the grand total up to one thousand four hundred volumes. The sum realized on them, as I make it out, was £365 12s. 9d., or nearly £100 more than Dr. Johnson's library brought after the lexicographer's death. Fielding was not a bibliophile like the famous Dr. Mead, whose collection of rare books Baker also had the

\* "Bibliographica," Vol. I, 1895, pp. 163-173; reprinted in "Eighteenth Century Vignettes," Third Series, 1896, pp. 164-178.

† "The Public Advertiser," Feb. 6, 1755. ‡ B. M. P. M. Catalogues 2.

§ See the photograph of "Fielding's Library," with annotations by Frederick S. Dickson, in Yale University Library.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

honour of knocking down with his hammer. Fielding's books, representing the accumulation of a quarter-century, were purchased solely for their use. They were read, some of them were annotated, and then they were placed upon his shelves for reference. In this way Fielding acquired the largest working library possessed by any man of letters in the eighteenth century, surpassing even Dr. Johnson's.

His law library comprised more than two hundred and twenty-eight volumes of which seventy-five were reports ("almost all" that then existed), and one hundred and fifty-three were text-books ranging from jurisprudence to practical guides for pleaders and justices of the peace. Bracton and Grotius are there as well as Dalton's "Country Justice" and Cowell's "Law Dictionary." The most valuable single item was Rymer's "Foedera" in twenty volumes, which sold for £15 10s. Next came thirty-four folios of the "Statutes at Large" at £10. Exclusive of books pertaining to the law, there were, then, one thousand and seventy volumes plus a certain number of pamphlets not separately listed. Nobody should be surprised to find among them many modern historians: such works as Mézeray's "Histoire de France," the "Historia sui Temporis" by Thuanus in seven volumes, Rushworth's "Historical Collections" in eight volumes, Somers's "Tracts" in sixteen volumes, Thurloe's "Collection of State Papers" in seven volumes, Holinshed's "Chronicles," Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion," Burnet's "History of his own Time," "The History of England" written by his quondam friend James Ralph, and those volumes of Echard and Rapin with which Squire Western's sister cultivated her mind. Lying with them cheek by jowl were nearly all their ancient brethren—for example, Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus the Sicilian, Arrian, Herodian, Livy, Sallust, Tacitus, and Suetonius. All these historians entered largely into the

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

reading of the man who claimed that his novels were but the history of contemporary manners.

None of the great writers of antiquity are absent. Lucian leads with seven editions in Greek and Latin and two translations, one into French and the other into English. Homer follows with six editions, if we count translations, and Horace with five. Next to these three favourites come Virgil, Plutarch, and Lucretius. Plato and Aristotle receive nearly equal honours, except that the latter is accompanied by the Greek scholiasts. Sophocles takes precedence over Aeschylus and Euripides; and Plautus over Terence. But to call the roll of the ancients in Fielding's library would be to name most of the minor as well as the major poets, orators, rhetoricians, and geographers whose works have survived. Among these, to proceed alphabetically, would be Aelianus, Anacreon, Apuleius, Aristophanes, Athenaeus, Catullus, Cicero, Claudian, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Juvenal, Longinus, Martial, Ovid, Pausanias, Perseus, Petronius, Pindar, Pliny, Plutarch, Propertius, Quintilian, Seneca, Silius Italicus, Stobaeus, Strabo, Theocritus, Tibullus, Valerius Flaccus, and Xenophon. The list should end with the "Bibliotheca" of Photius, containing epitomes of three hundred works which were read by this great scholar of the Greek Church but which afterwards went down in the wreck of the middle ages. Like Browning's grammarian, Fielding wished to know all, text and comment.

With Fielding there was no quarrel between the ancients and the moderns. He knew of that fierce controversy, possessed much of the literature upon it, and on the whole preferred the ancients to the moderns; but he never contended that literary merit is confined to any time, race, or civilization. The best of the moderns he placed with the best of the ancients. He read Montaigne, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Fénelon, Boileau, and Pascal. Of the Elizabethans, he was familiar with Shakespeare, Bacon, Spenser, Ben

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher. Milton he knew intimately, both his poems and tracts, also Cowley, Harrington, Fuller, Walton, Sir Thomas Brown, Butler, Suckling, Waller, and Denham. His library contained most of the dramatists of the Restoration—Dryden, Lee, Wycherley, Congreve, Otway, Southerne—and thereafter Steele, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar. With these wits was Jeremy Collier's denunciation of the immorality of the English stage bound with Congreve's angry reply to the parson. There were also Shaftesbury's "Characteristicks," and "The Tatler," "The Spectator," "The Guardian," and "The Freeholder" by the side of Temple and Swift, the English Cervantes and Lucian in one. Fielding liked books of travel, especially by antiquarians. He had Leland's "Itinerary," and John of Glastonbury's Latin history of Glastonbury Abbey as edited by Hearne. The last of these books which he added to his library was "The Ruins of Palmyra" (1753), the cuts in which he remembered when, on first seeing Lisbon, he drew a contrast between ancient and modern architecture. Nor should we forget his many books on the history and doctrines of his church, and on the controversies with the deists, in treatises, pamphlets, and sermons. Among these divines are Barrow, Chillingworth, South, and Tillotson; but the only modern philosopher that Fielding cared much for was Locke. The Bible, or parts of it, he possessed in several editions—in Greek, Latin, French, and English, with concordances and the commentators including Grotius. For all his wit, Fielding was a very sober gentleman.

Few novels of the time he thought worth preserving. "Pompey the Little" and "The Female Quixote" appear in the catalogue, probably because they were gifts from the authors; but there is no Defoe, no Marivaux, no Richardson, no Smollett—no copy of "Joseph Andrews" or "Tom Jones" or "Amelia." Cervantes is represented only by

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Jarvis's translation of "Don Quixote" in the reprint of 1749. The only one of his own novels offered for sale was a copy of the "Jonathan Wild" which he had recently revised. With this went a broken set of his "Dramatic Works," the first and third volumes of the "Miscellanies," and "An Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers." It may be that members of the family made reservations for their own use. But they were not many. Baker advertised for sale the "entire" library, not a part of it. Again the inference must be that Fielding and his family were careless of his fame.

This conclusion is enforced by the fact that John Fielding gave over to the auctioneer books annotated by his brother in his own hand. He let him have, for instance, two editions of Hawkins's "Pleas of the Crown"—the two folios of 1726, and the four octavos of 1728. Of these two sets, taking us back to the time when Henry Fielding began the study of the law, the former had "a great number of MSS. Notes by Mr. Fielding" and the latter was "interleaved with MSS. Notes by Mr. Fielding." Likewise his edition of Wood's "Institute of the Laws of England" was interleaved with innumerable notes. Not only did Brother John dispose of these books to the highest bidder, but he sold for thirteen shillings the "Law Manuscripts, by Mr. Fielding," in five volumes. Altogether, the miscellaneous manuscripts and annotated editions brought only £4 8s. The "Institute of the Laws of England" was knocked down at 5s. The value of no item was appreciably enhanced by Mr. Fielding's comment.

None of Fielding's annotated books have ever come to light; but about two of them there is a mystery which may be partially cleared up. They are Robert Ainsworth's "Dictionary of the Latin Tongue" "with MSS. Notes by Mr. Fielding," and the "Lexicon Graecum" of Benjamin Hedericus "cum Notis MSS. Henr. Fielding." Revised editions of these standard dictionaries were published, with

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

prefaces, under the name of William Young—the fourth edition of Ainsworth in 1752 and the third edition of Hedericus in 1755. Of the two, it will be sufficient to describe here Hedericus—a work consisting of two parts. In the first and major part we have Greek words with their meanings in Latin; while the second part, reversing the process, gives the Greek equivalents of Latin words. In a brief Latin address to the reader (“*Lectori Salutem*”), Young says that he consented, much against his will, to revise Hedericus “nearly three years ago” at the urgent request of the booksellers. He discovered many errors due to the compositors and to previous editors, all of which he corrected. The citations, which were often so corrupt as to be unintelligible, he collated with the original Greek, and added many fresh ones. Everywhere the Greek was so poorly translated into Latin, he claims, that he was compelled to substitute new renderings or new definitions. All this was excellent and perhaps well-deserved self-praise in the best manner of the eighteenth century. These facts explain why Fielding annotated Ainsworth and Hedericus. Like any other scholar, Fielding might make an incidental correction in a dictionary, but he was not a man who would go through Ainsworth and Hedericus methodically without some practical end in view. In a word, he collaborated to an unknown extent with Parson Young. All this hack-work he undertook at a time when he was presiding over the Bow Street court, when he was editing “*The Covent-Garden Journal*,” when he was writing “*Amelia*” and legal pamphlets. There are, however, limits to the labours that even a Fielding can perform. It seems probable that he and Young gave up in the summer of 1752 their project for translating Lucian because of the intrusion of Hedericus, following closely upon the heels of Ainsworth, who had been put out of the way in November, 1751. Somewhere in the folios of Parson Young’s revisions of Hedericus and

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Ainsworth are incorporated definitions and citations, Greek and Latin, of Henry Fielding the lexicographer.

In a number of instances, the auctioneer's clerk entered the surname of a purchaser on the margin of the catalogue. Occasionally an initial or a title before the name renders the identification complete. A man named Hull—presumably a young lawyer—took many of the law books and reports, but he was outbid on Rymer's "Foedera." The first night of the sale, Cooke and Woodward each invested a few shillings in the classics. Perhaps they were Thomas Cooke the translator and Henry Woodward the comedian, who wished a book each to remember their friend by. Upton—was it John Upton, afterwards the editor of Spenser?—attended the third night, bidding in Shadwell and Southerne and "Pompey the Little."\* Dyson paid £5 15s. for Thuanus. This gentleman of means should be Jeremiah Dyson who had purchased, some years before, the succession to the clerkship of the House of Commons for £6,000. Dr. Taylor—without doubt Dr. Robert Taylor, physician to the King—made several purchases, which included Homer, Demosthenes, and Strabo. Dr. Askew—Dr. Anthony Askew, of course, scholar and collector—picked out an Aldus for 19s. It was "Olympiodorus in Meteorologica Aristotelis" (Venice, 1551). Sir Roger Newdigate, the antiquary and benefactor of Oxford University, obtained the "Opera" of Lipsius (6 vols. Antwerp, 1605) for 5s., and "Cato, Varro, Columella, and Rutilius de Re Rustica" (Paris, 1533) for 8s. 6d. Against the name of Sir Paul Methuen, formerly British Ambassador to Portugal, appear three modern volumes ending with Dodwell's "Epistolary Discourse, proving that the Soul is Mortal." This little book to which Fielding sometimes alluded, the auctioneer let go for a shilling.

Several other purchasers may be partially, though not

\* It was the third edition with a dedication to Fielding.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

certainly, identified—John Wilkes, Daniel Wray the antiquary, and General Elliott, afterwards the defender of Gibraltar. A few books were lost or stolen; and twenty-odd remained unsold. No one, for example, wanted the Venerable Bede's “Ecclesiastical History”; and a gentleman who failed to find what he expected in Dr. Hill's “Review of the Works of the Royal Society,” returned it to the auctioneer and got his money back. Apparently the books which Fielding took with him to Lisbon were left there as gifts to his friends. At any rate, the volume of Plato from which he quoted in his journal and the edition of Bolingbroke's works which he was subjecting to a critical examination are both missing. Of his own works, Mr. Hull purchased “An Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers,” and Dr. Taylor the two volumes of his plays. Where the “Miscellanies” and “Jonathan Wild” went, where the annotated books and the law manuscripts went, the catalogue does not say. According to Murphy, John Fielding kept two manuscript volumes in folio dealing with crown law. It is uncertain whether they formed a part of the five volumes of manuscripts sold at public auction. Of course, though there is no positive evidence either way, John Fielding may have bid in all his brother's law manuscripts, one of which he subsequently published. The others may have been lost or destroyed, or they may still lie concealed in the library of a collector.

## II

The manuscript of the journal kept on the voyage to Lisbon, as it had a commercial value, was prepared for immediate publication. Preliminary notices in “The Public Advertiser” and elsewhere, beginning on February 6, 1755, congratulated the general public on the pleasure in store for them and sought to awaken the personal interest of Mr. Fielding's friends in a work to be published and sold for

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“the benefit of his widow and children.” With the same end in view, John Fielding dispatched brief notes to people of consequence about town. Three lines, on the eve of publication, to the Rev. Dr. Birch—Dr. Thomas Birch, the historian and acting-secretary of the Royal Society—requested him to assist the volume through the beau monde by his recommendation.\* The next morning, February 25, 1755,† duly appeared “The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon . . . by the late Henry Fielding, Esq.” The little book was printed for Andrew Millar and it sold for three shillings. Though the addition is not mentioned on the title-page, the journal proper is followed by “A Fragment of a Comment on L. Bolingbroke’s Essays.” A “Dedication to the Public,” rather apologetic in tone, commends to “the genuine patrons of extraordinary capacities” the posthumous piece, meaning the journal, “of a genius that has long been your delight and entertainment.”

However, that a reader might not be too expectant of enjoyment the candid gentleman who wrote the dedication added: “It must be acknowledged that a lamp almost burnt out does not give so steady and uniform a light, as when it blazes in its full vigour; but yet it is well known that, by its wavering, as if struggling against its own dissolution, it sometimes darts a ray as bright as ever.” And again: “If in this little work there should appear any traces of a weaken’d and decay’d life, let your own imaginations place before your eyes a true picture, in that of a hand trembling in almost its latest hour, of a body emaciated with pains, yet struggling for your entertainment; and let this affecting picture open each tender heart, and call forth a melting tear, to blot out whatever failings may be found in a work begun in pain, and finished almost at the same period with life.” Still preserving his condescension, the sentimental

\* British Museum, Sloane MSS., 4307, f. 271.

† “The London Evening Post,” Feb. 22-25, 1755.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

gentleman said further: "It was thought proper, by the friends of the deceased, that this little piece should come into your hands as it came from the hands of the author; it being judged that you would be better pleased to have an opportunity of observing the faintest traces of a genius you have long admired, than have it patch'd by a different hand; by which means the marks of its true author might have been effac'd."

This last sentence means, if it means anything, that the editor had not tampered with the manuscript. Accordingly, no one was prepared for the discovery made by Mr. Austin Dobson, twenty-five years ago, that there were two versions of "The Journal" bearing the date of 1755. Both have the same title-page, neither being marked as the second edition; both have the same dedication; both therefore assure the reader that the words of the book are Fielding's own. But the two versions vary, here and there, all the way through in phrasing; one of them contains long passages not found in the other; in one the name of the landlady at Ryde is Mrs. Francis, while in the other it is Mrs. Humphrys. In a word, one version was unedited, and the other was carefully edited by Fielding or by someone else. Opinion has differed on which is the correct version, that is, on which one Fielding intended for the public. The edited text was reprinted at Dublin in 1756, and it was followed by Miss Godden in her recent biography of Fielding. The unedited text was chosen by Murphy for his edition of 1762, and it was eventually accepted by Mr. Dobson. Murphy, the friend of Mrs. Fielding and Andrew Millar, could have made no mistake in so important a matter.

With this question, however, is involved another. Which text was first published? To the second question Mr. Dobson found the answer. "The Monthly Review" for March, 1755, he observed, describes the "Comment on Bolingbroke" as "a small introductory sketch, of only twenty-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

seven pages." In the edited version the "Comment" occupies twenty-seven pages and a half; or, if we deduct the space required for the second title and what was lost by the compositor just before the first section, there are exactly twenty-seven pages of text; whereas in the unedited version, in which the type is more closely set, the "Comment" occupies only twenty-two and a half pages. This simple test renders controversy impossible. The version of "The Journal" published on February 25, 1755, was the one thoroughly edited—and thoroughly mutilated.

To this conclusion a curious detail has been added by Mr. R. A. Austen Leigh, who met with the following entry in the ledger of William Strahan, the printer of the book:

Jan. 1755 Voyage to Lisbon 10 sheets No 2500  
Extraordinary corrections 17/.  
" " do. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed No 2500 12 sheets.\*

That is, in January, 1755, Strahan printed 2,500 copies of "The Journal," using for the purpose ten sheets for each copy. Subsequently, in the same month, he printed on twelve sheets the same number of additional copies containing the "extraordinary corrections" for which he made a special charge of seventeen shillings—a comparatively small sum, clearly insufficient to have met the entire cost of the numerous alterations. This revised impression he designated as a "second edition," although the words were not placed on the title-page. An examination of the two so-called editions shows that the unedited impression covers nearly ten sheets, while the edited impression, owing to more liberal spacing, covers about twelve sheets. In other words, "The Journal" was first set up and printed directly from Fielding's manuscript; then someone intervened, the first impression was laid aside (but not destroyed, as we

\* First published by Mr. J. Paul de Castro in "The Library," April, 1917. On the two editions, see further Mr. Frederick S. Dickson in the same periodical, Jan., 1917, and Mr. Austin Dobson's introduction to the edited version, London, 1892. See also Mr. A. W. Pollard in "The Library," Jan. and July, 1917.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

shall see), and for it was substituted a revised text which went to the reviewers and of course to the general public also. By this interchange, the second *printed* edition of "The Journal" became the first *published* edition.

And but for an earthquake the chances are that we should not now have the unedited text. Before the year was over, the eyes of the whole world were turned towards Lisbon, which during the first ten days of November was nearly destroyed by an earthquake and the fires that followed. Captain Veal, who bore a charmed life, whether on land or sea, was there at the time and safely escaped with "The Queen of Portugal."\* By the end of November, the London newspapers were filled with letters of survivors descriptive of the terrible calamity, and Millar took advantage of it to dispose of his surplus stock of "The Journal." As if the book had never before been published, it was advertised in "The Whitehall Evening Post" for November 29-December 2, 1755; and the price was put at two shillings and sixpence, if one wished to take it "sewed" instead of in boards. As there was no longer any appeal to the public in behalf of widow and children, it is evident that the edited version, which Millar sold as an agent of the family, had become nearly if not quite exhausted, and that with their consent he now placed on the market the impression which had been suppressed. Probably he purchased the copyright in the book. All told, Mrs. Fielding must have received for the two editions several hundred pounds. This in brief is how it happened that we may now read "The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon" in the words which the author wrote instead of in a text altered and expurgated.

Without doubt, the person who had tried to keep from the world the true text was John Fielding. Though he may have received some aid from Margaret Collier, he was the responsible editor of the abridged version. He could

\* "The Gentleman's Magazine," XXV, 559 (Dec., 1755).

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

not, however, have written the "Dedication to the Public" common to both versions. John was a very cautious man, but he was not a cheat or a liar. He would not have promised an honest text and then proceeded to mangle it at will when he sat down to work. The dedication, parts of which are in harmony with Millar's preliminary announcements, was prepared by a writer in his employ. The author may have been a publisher's hack, or he may have been Arthur Murphy, who later patronized the novelist in the same vulgar manner; but he surely was not John Fielding, who almost certainly knew nothing of the statements made in the dedication. A comparison of the dedication in its phrasing with the essay which Murphy prefixed to Fielding's works in 1762 can leave little or no question that the same hand wrote both. As soon as "The Journal" was set up from Fielding's manuscript, an advance copy, I take it, was sent to John Fielding for approval. As he listened to the reading by some member of the household, he was astounded at his brother's frankness and immediately ordered publication to be stayed until the book could be properly edited. This task the blind man undertook himself, probably dictating to Miss Collier the multitude of alterations which he deemed expedient. A word or a phrase which he disliked, he removed and substituted for it another, in the interest of a faultless style. Passages which reflected on persons still living, he ruthlessly deleted or toned down to the commonplace. Incidentally, he sought to protect his own character and that of his brother. From the eighteenth-century point of view, he was justified in all that he did, provided he did not know, as was probably the case, of a dedication implying a contrary procedure. The man on whom blame must be laid for an inconsistency which amounted almost to a fraud, was Andrew Millar, who, in his haste to bring out the book, used for the edited text a preface which had been prepared for the unedited version.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

John's refinements on Henry's English may be ignored for the excisions and substitutions prompted by prudence. And of these even, no full account can be given here. First of all, John guarded the reputation of Captain Veal with extreme care. This was most natural, for the old privateer was now almost a personal friend, who had taken Henry out to Lisbon and brought back letters from him. In the circumstances, all his weaknesses should be concealed. Accordingly, as made over by the editor, Captain Veal is no longer a "tyrant" or a "bashaw"; he does not strut about his ship, cursing his passengers and the winds, but merely declares his opinions emphatically; when his cat is suffocated under a bed he does not set up an "Irish howl," but expresses a concern which testifies "great goodness of heart"; he does not boast of friendships with men above him with whom he merely has an acquaintance; he does not dine with "inferior officers" on another ship, but with "the officers" as if the highest in command sought his company; he does not break his word after the most solemn promises; he is not ignorant of everything except his ship; he does not lose his course when in a hurricane off Dartmouth; he does not become outrageous in his conduct after drinking heavily; he does not remain on shore all night at Ryde when he should be aboard his ship; he does not pass "two-thirds" of his time at backgammon with the Portuguese friar, but only his "leisure hours"; he does not stumble over Elias in reading the service; nor are his ears quite so impervious to sound as Fielding would make them out to be. He is a gallant old sea-dog, a little odd in his behaviour. To complete the portrait, John added several compliments, of which one was taken from a letter of his brother, but most were his own. It was John not Henry who said of him that "whether the wind was fair or foul, he always made the most of it, for he never let go his anchor but with a manifest concern."

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

The editor's most extensive cuts deal with the visit which Captain Veal received from his nephew off Ryde and the scenes between Fielding, the steward, and the captain when the ship lay in Tor Bay. But these lively passages are too long for quotation. It will suffice to recall Captain Veal as Henry sketched him before weighing anchor at Rotherhithe, and then to present him as re-formed by John into an exemplary character. This, the reader may remember, is what Henry actually wrote:

“He had been the captain of a privateer, which he chose to call being in the king's service, and thence derived a right of hoisting the military ornament of a cockade over the button of his hat. He likewise wore a sword of no ordinary length by his side, with which he swaggered in his cabin, among the wretches his passengers, whom he had stowed in cupboards on each side. He was a person of a very singular character. He had taken it into his head that he was a gentleman, from those very reasons that proved he was not one; and to shew himself a fine gentleman, by a behaviour which seemed to insinuate he had never seen one. He was, moreover, a man of gallantry; at the age of seventy he had the finicalness of Sir Courtly Nice, with the roughness of Surly; and while he was deaf himself, had a voice capable of deafening all others.”

And this is all that John left of him:

“He had been the captain of a privateer, which he looked upon as being in the king's service; and in this capacity he had gained great honour, having distinguished his bravery in some very warm engagements, for which he had justly received public thanks; and from hence he derived a right of hoisting the military ornament of a cockade over the button of his hat, and of wearing a sword of no ordinary length.”

John's minor alterations have almost equal interest. The real name of the innkeeper's wife at Ryde, Fielding defi-

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

nitely states, was Mrs. Francis. John changed it, probably on the advice of Margaret Collier, to Mrs. Humphrys in order that her ladyship might not take offence at the disagreeable portrait. In another place, he deleted a phrase so that the reader might not identify the wife of Lord Anson. On the other hand, he introduced a military incident in the life of “a brother of mine”—either his half-brother Edmund or his own brother William, both of whom had been officers in the army. He removed a hit at the window-tax, which was then resented by country gentlemen, and Henry’s caustic remarks on the treatment he had received from the Duke of Newcastle, in whose ante-room he had cooled his heels and caught cold. Of course the Bow Street justice must keep on friendly terms with the Government. “Quin the player,” wrote Henry, if I may repeat the profane anecdote, “on taking a nice and severe survey of a fellow-comedian, burst forth into this exclamation, ‘If that fellow be not a rogue, God Almighty doth not write a legible hand.’” For “God Almighty” John the Puritan substituted “the Creator.” These are but instances in an extended revision whereby the original manuscript lost more than three thousand words. One excision, however, does great credit to the heart of the editor. When a storm was raging at sea, Fielding faced with tranquillity threatened shipwreck for himself and family, remarking of his wife and daughter: “I have often thought they are both too good, and too gentle, to be trusted to the power of any man I know, to whom they could possibly be so trusted.” John would not permit the conclusion of this sentence to stand, for he, if not his brother, knew there was a man to whom wife and children could be trusted. That man was John Fielding.

The manuscript of “The Journal,” so far as is known, no longer exists; but as it was written in the trembling hand of a dying man, much of it must have been difficult to make

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

out. Accordingly numerous errors crept into the text, due to a misreading of Fielding's words as well as to the compositors' want of care. Some of these mistakes were corrected by John; but as he was blind, the greater part necessarily escaped him. A partial list of those which appear in both impressions comprises "Sir William Petyt" for "Sir William Petty," "couch" for "coach," "carelesly" for "carelessly," "suppositions" for "superstitions," "to" for "too," "wherever" for "whenever," "ly" for "ply," and "enroling" for "enrolling." Once in print several of these and similar curiosities have persisted to this day. Fielding still rides from Fordhook to the London docks in a "couch"; boats still "ly" or "lie" instead of "ply" between Chatham and the Tower of London, and the Portuguese are still firm believers in the most absurd "suppositions."\*

This is the end of the story of the two versions. No one at the time, not even the participants, seems to have been troubled by the unintentional fraud. It was impossible for an editor to take all the life and colour out of the book if he left anything. Still, it is only in "the earthquake edition" that Fielding perfectly reveals his character with that "artless inadvertence" of which Lowell once spoke. "The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon" as Fielding wrote it, is representative of that very highest literary art wherein art appears to be one with nature.

Fielding's death made no material difference in the attitude of his contemporaries towards him. The very month he died, he was accused by a facetious scribbler of conducting the Bow Street court in the interest of disreputable gentlemen to the detriment of the poor and innocent;† and when a few months later "A Voyage to Lisbon" appeared,

\* F. S. Dickson, manuscript "Index to The Voyage to Lisbon."

† "Memoirs of the Shakespear's-Head in Covent-Garden," dated 1755, but published in Oct., 1754.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

the book had to run the gauntlet of enemies as well as friends. The reviewers who took it up in February or March were, on the whole, kindly disposed. "The London Magazine" thought that the work of the late Mr. Fielding was "far from doing discredit to his memory." "This narrative," said "The Monthly Review," "tho' not greatly abounding with incidents, we have perused with some pleasure. The reflections interspersed in it, are worthy of a writer, than whom few, if any, have been more justly celebrated for a thorough insight into human nature." Somewhat warmer praise came from "The Gentleman's Magazine": "The captain, the seamen, the landlady and her husband, and several other characters, which the particular circumstances of his situation brought under his notice, are described, with that humour in which he is confessed to have excelled every other writer of his age. But this little book would be very valuable for the instruction which it contains, if the entertainment was wanting; the remarks upon his own situation, upon the manners of others, upon many intollerable inconveniences which arise either from the defect of our laws, or the ignorance of those by whom they should be executed, deserve the attention not of individuals only but of the public. . . . The fragment of an answer to Bolingbroke, however short, will strongly incline every man who has a taste for wit, and a love of truth, to wish it was longer." The unknown author of this notice reflected a very general interest in Fielding's keen philosophic insight and his denunciation of the existing maritime laws. Some years later, as Fielding urged in his digression on the exploitation of the poor, Parliament struck a blow at the fish monopoly in London and Westminster.\*

On the other hand, his cousin Lady Mary regarded the book as a trivial performance. "The most edifying part

\* "Statutes at Large," 2 Geo. III, Cap. 15.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

of the Journal to Lisbon," she wrote to her daughter from Italy, "is the history of the kitten: I was the more touched by it, having a few days before found one, in deplorable circumstances, in a neighboring vineyard. I did not only relieve her present wants with some excellent milk, but had her put into a clean basket, and brought to my own house, where she has lived ever since very comfortably."\* Lady Mary had in mind the story of Captain Veal's cat which escaped drowning in the sea only to be smothered under a feather bed. That is all the book meant to her, though, to say the truth, no incident in the voyage is related with more delightful humour. Similarly, Horace Walpole, who read a few pages, described "Fielding's Travels" as nothing more than "an account how his dropsy was treated and teased by an innkeeper's wife in the Isle of Wight."†

Quite naturally Mrs. Francis, though disguised as Mrs. Humphrys, derived no pleasure from the faithful description of herself and her inn by a master hand unaccustomed to gloss the truth. It so happens that we know just what she said. Within a few weeks after the publication of "A Voyage to Lisbon," she received a visit from a group of travellers, who looked over her house, told her what Mr. Fielding had written of Ryde, and inquired about his behaviour while he was staying at her inn. When she heard the story, "the old woman," overflowing with gall, fell into a rage. She gave the lie to the account, and presented her compliments to the memory of Mr. Fielding, "the strangest man in the world, whom it was impossible to please," who cursed her husband because he inquired about the sick man's disorder when he was expected to talk about crops, who ransacked "every place for the means to gratify his depraved appetite," and yet paid his bills "no more than

\* "Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu," edited by Wharncliffe, third edition, 1861, II, 283.

† "Letters of Horace Walpole," edited by Toynbee, III, 294.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

he chose." While at Ryde, he never dined in a barn, but always in his own chamber, where "he cook'd his victuals, dressing as much as he could of it by a chamber fire; and making the sauce himself." The room was the best in the house, decently furnished with "two good beds in it, and a handsome looking-glass," over which he had a napkin hung so that "he might not be struck with his own figure, while he was exaggerating that of others." His story of the miraculous venison was a mere fiction; it was not sent to him as a present; it was purchased of a man at Southampton, whither he dispatched his servant with a half-guinea to pay for it and fetch it to Ryde.

All this was put down in a letter of one of the visitors, dated at Ryde, March 31, 1755. There is no signature, but on the back is the inscription in another hand, supposed to be Samuel Richardson's: "On Mr. Fielding's story Isle of Wight, March 31 1755, Miss Peggy Collier." The writer, however, could not have been Margaret Collier; for she was with Fielding at Ryde the year before and so knew all that occurred there; whereas the author of the letter writes as one on a visit to the inn for the first time. A phrase or two, such as "tormenting himself, and all about him" rather suggests Jane Collier as Richardson's informant, if indeed the letter was written for that man's delight. Of two sisters seen much together, correspondents both, it is quite easy for a mature gentleman, in docketing their letters, to slip in the name of the one for the other—to credit to Peggy what really belongs to Jenny.\*

\* The letter from Ryde was published entire with comment by Mr. J. Paul de Castro in "The Library," April, 1917, pp. 157-159.

It is still possible to test one of the landlady's statements. In his letter to his brother from Tor Bay, Fielding says that he obtained the venison from "the New Forest" (less specific only than "Southampton"). In the "Voyage" he does not give, for literary reasons, this detail. There he describes the venison playfully as a gift of fortune, in that it came with the hoy much sooner than either was expected. There is no contradiction, for Fielding never meant to imply that the venison was an actual present from a friend. As in this instance,

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

As has been related earlier, Margaret Collier nevertheless went to Ryde in the autumn of 1755 for the winter; where she was met with the rumour that not Fielding but herself was the author of "a very dull and unentertaining piece," which seemed to rise hardly above a woman's understanding. "I was sadly vexed," she wrote to Richardson on the third of October, "at my first coming, at a report which had prevailed here, of my being the author of Mr. Fielding's last work, 'The Voyage to Lisbon': the reason which was given for supposing it mine, was to the last degree mortifying, (viz that it was so very bad a performance, and fell so far short of his other works, it must needs be the person *with him* who wrote it) . . . Alas! my good Mr. Richardson, is not this a hard case?"\* Margaret does not give the name of the person who called Fielding's last work a very bad performance; but her friend and protector at Ryde was Mrs. Roberts, who would have made no such remark. Surely the good lady had no reason to resent her charming portrait drawn with every regard for a noble woman's delicacy. Neither she nor her daughters, we may be certain, failed to detect in the new book the same genius that wrote "Tom Jones" and "Amelia." Undoubtedly the truth is that Margaret Collier, who, as I have said, probably assisted John Fielding in his mutilations, magnified what she had done, and thus occasioned the rumour of which she complained. It has all turned out as she professed to wish. No one long ascribed to her a work sufficient unto eternal fame.

Margaret Collier's hostile tone must be discounted at all points. Perhaps she was piqued because she was not mentioned in "The Journal"; she was certainly angry because Fielding interfered with her flirtations in Lisbon; Fielding's account of his visit at Ryde was, I believe, essentially true in all respects. Whether he purchased a whole buck or half a buck is immaterial.

\* Barbauld, "Correspondence of Richardson," II, 77-78.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

and above all else she was writing to a man touched to the quick by Fielding's insinuation that Mr. Richardson's novels were not conducive to the cultivation of good manners in those who read them. From Richardson his correspondents took their cue. Even more submissive than Miss Collier was Mr. Thomas Edwards, a "very good, pious, and kind-hearted man," who may have sincerely believed that the "divine Clarissa" had "tamed and humanized hearts that before were not so very sensible." The vulgarity of Richardson's characters Edwards could not see. Hence no one need be surprised to find the good man writing to the great author on the twenty-eighth of May, 1755: "I have lately read over with much indignation Fielding's last piece, called his *Voyage to Lisbon*. That a man, who had led such a life as he had, should trifle in that manner when immediate death was before his eyes, is amazing. From this book I am confirmed in what his other works had fully persuaded me of, that with all his parade of pretences to virtuous and humane affections, the fellow had no heart. And so—his knell is knolled."\* Miss Collier, be it observed, said nothing against the personal character of Fielding; it was reserved for a Richardsonian who had no acquaintance with him, who doubtless never saw him, to expose the hypocrite and profane jester in the man who, like Cervantes, met his fate with no open defiance, no ill-natured murmur, but with cheerful fortitude. Everybody now agrees with Southey who said long afterwards: "Never did any man's natural hilarity support itself so marvelously under complicated diseases, and every imaginable kind of discomfort."†

### III

A hint in the preface to "The Journal" that further

\* Barbauld, "Correspondence of Richardson," III, 125.

† "The Correspondence of Southey with Caroline Bowles," edited by Dowden, 1881, pp. 184 and 198.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

manuscripts of Fielding awaited publication evoked a moderate degree of interest. "We are given to understand," said "The Monthly Review," "that Mr. Fielding hath left behind him some other pieces, which, we hope, will follow this . . . posthumous volume of an author, who long hath been, and will continue to be, the delight of his readers." The next piece, the appearance of which was long delayed, must have been rather disappointing to those who expected wit and humour; for it was "A Treatise on the Office of Constable," which Sir John Fielding (he was knighted in 1761) included in a volume of "Extracts from . . . the Penal Laws," first published in October, 1761, and several times reissued. The treatise, running to forty-odd pages, opens with an address by Sir John to the constables within the jurisdiction of his court, explaining its origin and purpose. On the first point, it is said:

"The late *Henry Fielding*, who for some Time executed the important Office of principal acting Magistrate for the County of *Middlesex* and City and Liberty of *Westminster*, so much to his own Honour and so much to the Advantage of his Country, observing from daily Experience the great Difficulties and Dangers to which the Peace Officers were exposed in the Execution of their Office, either from the desperate Behaviour of Felons, the Cunning of Cheats, or what is worse than both, the Attacks of litigious Persons under the Influence and Directions of the lowest of Attorneys, who are ready on all Occasions to point out any Irregularity committed by a Peace Officer, and to make their Advantage of it, to the Injury, nay, often to the Ruin of the Officer, resolved to draw up and publish a plain and complete Account of the Office of Constable, which he begun; but by a lingering Illness, which put a Period to his valuable Life, he was prevented from perfecting this useful Work; and as several Constables have of late subjected themselves to Prosecutions from Errors in their Judg-

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

ment, I have carefully collected and revised the Observations found among my Brother's Manuscripts on this Subject, and have made such Additions as may possibly render the Work more useful, though I am far from offering it to the Public as a perfect Treatise.”\*

Sir John's additions were necessarily of a general nature, for a writer without eyes has his limitations; he can build poems and essays, plays and novels even, out of his imagination, but he cannot go far into history or the literature of fact. Sir John always compiled rather than wrote books. It was his custom to have some one make extracts for him, and then he dictated the necessary comment. He could never have written “A Treatise on the Office of Constable,” which displays careful research into authorities and a study and comparison of many statutes, with exact references. Work like this requires eyes that can see. Accordingly, the treatise in question must have been published essentially as it was left by Henry Fielding. Moreover, it proceeds by the method which he followed in “A Charge to the Grand Jury” and in “An Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers”: but it is without the humour and wide sweep of these pamphlets, for it was intended only for the guidance of constables. No one else would ever think of reading it either for pleasure or for profit. As a body of instructions to the police, having no literary value beyond clear and exact statement, the handbook does credit to a faithful magistrate who employed every means in his power to the enforcement of the law and to the social welfare of Middlesex.

No more of Fielding's legal manuscripts were published by his brother; but there still remained a play which had never been performed. Back in the winter of 1742-1743, as

\* Quoted from “Extracts . . . from the Penal Laws,” dated 1769, pp. 321-322. The edition of 1768, as well as that of 1769, is described as “A New Edition.” The first edition is announced in “The London Magazine,” Oct., 1761, XXX, 564.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

has been related in an earlier chapter, Garrick, wishing to appear in a new rôle, induced Fielding to revise for the purpose "The Good-Natur'd Man," one of the comedies which had been left on the playwright's hands when the Licensing Act was passed. The play was accepted by Fleetwood, the manager of Drury Lane, and "ordered to be written into parts," when Fielding abruptly withdrew it because it had glaring technical faults and contained no rôle that would keep the great actor before the audience throughout the performance. In its place was substituted "The Wedding Day." Still, despite its imperfections, Fielding had a high opinion of "The Good-Natur'd Man"; and not long before his voyage to Lisbon—perhaps towards the close of 1753—he submitted the manuscript to his friend Sir Charles Hanbury Williams for that gentleman's criticism. A few weeks later, Sir Charles was sent abroad on various diplomatic missions, which terminated in his appointment as Envoy Extraordinary to St. Petersburg, where he fell desperately ill, though he reached home for the last dismal scenes of despondency and suicide. Fielding on his own deathbed,\* it was said, told his wife and daughter that Sir Charles had the comedy; he evidently looked forward to its performance for their benefit. The story may be apocryphal, but the chances are that it is true, and that it came from Mrs. Fielding. Subsequently the family made many inquiries for the play. Did Sir Charles take it with him into Russia? or did he leave it at home?—These were the puzzling questions. It was certainly mislaid or lost; it could nowhere be found; all hope of ever recovering it was abandoned.

The manuscript, contrary to a surmise of Sir John Fielding, never had the honour of a journey into Russia. It had reposited all the time in the library of Sir Charles at Coldbrook Park, his seat in Monmouthshire. Contemporary

\* "The London Chronicle," Dec. 1-3, 1778.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

accounts of its recovery differ considerably. I can only give a consistent story, which may not be true in all details. Sometime in 1776, John Hanbury Williams, nephew and heir to Sir Charles, in looking over the library at Cold-brook, came across "a tatter'd manuscript play," and sent it as a present to his brother-in-law, Thomas Johnes, member of Parliament for Cardigan, thinking that the squire would like to add this piece of antiquity to his collection of curiosities. The discoverer, who supposed the play to be one of his uncle's own effusions, did not hesitate to pronounce it "a damn'd thing." Mr. Johnes, however, was of a quite different opinion. He had a copy made of the manuscript, which he placed in the hands of Mr. Albany Wallis, a close friend of Garrick's, with the request that he show it to the actor. Wallis waited upon Garrick, who, on casting his eye over the manuscript, exclaimed: "The lost sheep is found! This is Harry Fielding's comedy!" "With the most amiable politeness," Mr. Johnes restored the foundling to Fielding's family, and Mr. Garrick offered to take it under his protection.

Unfortunately there had been a quarrel between Garrick and Sir John Fielding, the spokesman of the family. It arose in 1773 over the frequent performance of "The Beggar's Opera" at Drury Lane Theatre, of which Garrick was then the manager. Sir John almost demanded that the play be suppressed on the ground that a humorous presentation of crime has a disastrous effect upon the audience, especially upon young persons. An angry controversy followed.\* According to the newspapers, Sir John suggested that, if the play were to go on, Macheath be hanged in the last Act; and Garrick replied that he could not agree

\* See "A Letter to Sir John Fielding occasioned by his extraordinary request to Mr. Garrick for the Suppression of the Beggar's Opera" (1773). On Garrick and Sir John, see further John Forster, "The Life and Times of Goldsmith," sixth edition, 1877, especially II, 36-37; and "The Private Correspondence of David Garrick," 1832, II, 169-170.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

to this, for a theatrical manager, unlike a justice of the peace, does not receive a fee for every man hanged in the interest of public morals. Nevertheless, on Garrick's retirement from the stage in 1776, "amid acclamations and tears," Sir John joined with everybody else in congratulating "the inimitable actor" on his splendid career. Half withdrawing his former charge, he also praised Garrick for his "exemplary life" and his "great service" as theatrical manager, "to the morals of a dissipated age." On the same day, Garrick sent Sir John a handsome reply, in which he expressed keen regret that "an old family connexion of love and regard" had ever been disturbed by jealousy and misunderstanding. It was, however, on Sir John's part nothing more than a formal reconciliation; and so the quarrel easily broke out again over "The Good-Natur'd Man." As soon as Garrick, who was in no wise at fault, identified the lost play, he visited Sir John, told him of the discovery, saying that he could not have been happier had he found "a mine of gold" on his land, and took upon himself all the labour of preparing it for the stage. Sir John, says Garrick, "thanked me cordially and we parted with mutual expressions of kindness." But something subsequently occurred. Apparently Sir John disapproved of proposed alterations in the play, and feared that the actor would work the mine of gold for himself rather than for a family in distress. Garrick was overcome with grief by these suspicions and remonstrated with Sir John for insinuating them. He had but one aim, he declared, which was to make the performance a perfect success, pecuniary as well as artistic.

Eventually Garrick was given a free hand; but owing to persistent ill health if to nothing else, his alterations must have been comparatively few. Certainly, he did not, as he had first planned, reconstruct the entire play. That would have been in any case an impossible labour; for the design of

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

“The Good-Natur’d Man,” whatever might be thought of it, was perfectly consistent throughout, and could be modified only to its harm. Any large rearrangement of its parts, any change in the conclusion, would have meant an altogether different play. The result would have been Garrick, not Fielding. It was observed by Genest that two of the characters—Sir George and Mr. Boncour—were drawn, with differences, from the two brothers in the “*Adelphi*” of Terence. This relationship between the two plays, which extends to many incidents, would indicate that Fielding wrote out his first draft during the period when he was experimenting with Latin comedy, or sometime between “*The Miser*” (1733) and “*Pasquin*” (1736). From this sketch, he completed the play during the first weeks of 1743, when he was depressed by poverty and illness. Consequently, “*The Good-Natur’d Man*” assumed a very sober and moral tone. Specifically, it reflects the mood of “*An Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men*,” which went into the “*Miscellanies*” of 1743. Indeed, it is in its main intent a sermon on good nature and its final triumph over the many impositions laid upon it by a cunning world. All the bad characters are unmasked and properly punished; while the young country squire, who has been spoiled by the grand tour, must be sent to school before he can hope to win the hand of the charming heroine. Of course, there are many gay scenes and many strokes of exquisite wit and humour. More than all else a reader is almost startled to find here a Squire Western long before he appeared in “*Tom Jones*. ” Still, “*The Good-Natur’d Man*” is in the main a homily by a very earnest preacher. Garrick when he undertook to rewrite it, quickly gave up the undertaking. It had to go to the theatre essentially as it came from the hands of Fielding.

This is not to assert that no alterations were made. The most cursory reader will see that Fielding’s almost inevi-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

table *hath* is modernized to *has* in many places. Moreover, as the manuscript was “tatter’d,” words not Fielding’s had to be inserted. Editing such as this is self-evident. Doubtless, too, there was considerable rephrasing, but no one can say just where. An allusion, in the fifth Act, to the war with France may have been an addition of Garrick’s in harmony with the practice at the time; but even this is very doubtful, for England and France were at war when Fielding revised his play in 1743. Perhaps the apology at the end for a comedy without a catastrophe is Garrick’s; it hardly sounds like Fielding. The most suspicious places, however, are the quarrels between Mr. and Mrs. Boncour, particularly the one at the very beginning of the play. These seem to have been retouched, not by Garrick but by Sheridan—by the hand that created Sir Peter and Lady Teazle. No doubt whatever can arise over a change in the title. Fielding called his comedy “*The Good-Natur’d Man.*” Subsequently, after Fielding’s death, Goldsmith employed the same title for his first comedy. There could not be on the stage at the same time two plays of precisely the same name; and to prevent confusion, Fielding’s title was enlarged to “*The Fathers: or, The Good-Natur’d Man.*” The incident is curious rather than important. Either title is appropriate enough. The two fathers are Mr. Boncour and Old Valence, exactly opposite in disposition and in their manner of bringing up their children—the one nearly ruins them by indulgence, the other completely ruins them by severity and meanness.

Sheridan, who had succeeded Garrick in the management of Drury Lane, left nothing undone to make the appearance of “*The Fathers*” a most brilliant occasion. He provided new scenery and new costumes; and in order to give room for Fielding’s play, he withdrew for several nights his own “*School for Scandal*,” then in its first glory. King, who was playing Sir Peter Teazle, took the part of Sir George;

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

while Bensley, the famous Malvolio, chose the rôle of Mr. Boncour, the good-natured man. Parsons, Baddeley, and Dodd—the Crabtree, Moses and Backbite of “The School for Scandal”—were cast as Old Valence, Sir Gregory fresh from his Somerset kennels, and his son who learned in his travels abroad a few more oaths than he already knew. All the actors belonged to that group of wonderful comedians whom Lamb saw in his youth and immortalized in his *Elia*. By this handsome treatment of “The Fathers,” Sheridan cancelled his indebtedness to Fielding for many a hint towards his own characters and scenes. It was the noble tribute of one great author to the memory of another.

The first performance, set down for Saturday, November 28, was deferred until Monday, owing, the newspapers said, to the “indisposition” of a principal actor. As a matter of fact, the comedy was not ready for presentation until Monday. That night Garrick occupied his box, with a party composed of the “heavenly Lady Spencer” and her friends. The anticipated presence of the great actor was in itself enough to draw a large audience; but there was a surprise in store for all except the very few. The playbills announced a prologue and an epilogue, but they did not name the author. Both, however, were written by Garrick, who finished the former on November 17, and sent it to Lady Spencer for her criticism. Three days later she thanked him for the compliment and accepted his invitation to go with him to the play. The secret entrusted with Lady Spencer and other close friends came out before the performance was over; and the news was in all the papers the next day. In his pleasant and rather whimsical prologue, Garrick makes various characters in “*Tom Jones*” and “*Joseph Andrews*” address the audience in praise of Harry Fielding and his comedy. “It was delivered,” says “*Lloyd’s Evening Post*,” “by Mr. King with great humour, and received with universal applause.” “The epilogue,”

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

it is added, "was a facetious attack on gentlemen's hats, in return for the sarcasms that have been thrown on ladies' caps." The honour of speaking it fell to Miss Younge, a vivacious actress who played the part of Miss Boncour.

Garrick's days were now fast approaching their end. Probably he never again attended the theatre; certainly he never again contributed to it. Lady Spencer immediately took him into the country for the Christmas holidays, where he became critically ill. A few weeks later his friends buried him in Westminster Abbey. Among the first of Garrick's amateur parts on coming to London, it will be remembered, had been Gregory in Fielding's "Mock Doctor"; his last act connected with the theatre was to bring out Fielding's posthumous comedy with prologue and epilogue. The afterpiece on the first night was "The Irish Widow," which Garrick had reworked several years before from Molière's "Mariage Forcé." Thus he completed the perfect arch of mutual friendship and admiration.

"The Fathers" ran, not quite continuously, for nine nights, beginning on November 30, and ending on December 12. At the third, sixth, and ninth performances, which were for the benefit of Mrs. Fielding, unusual efforts appear to have been made to fill the house; for we find Sir John appealing for aid to William Hunter, the surgeon who had attended his brother, in the following letter, written three days before the second benefit was to take place:

"Sir John Fielding presents his compliments to Dr. Hunter, and acquaints him that the Comedy of 'The Good-natured Man' written by the late Mr. Henry Fielding will be performed at Drury Lane next Monday being the Author's Widow's night.

"He was your old and sincere friend. There are no other of his Works left unpublished. This is the last opportunity you will have of shewing any respect to his Memory as a Genius, so that I hope you will send all your Pupils, all

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

your Patients, all your Friends, & everybody else to the Play that Night, by which Means you will indulge your benevolent feelings and your Sentiments of Friendship

“Bow Street, Dec<sup>r</sup> 4, 1778”\*

So far as the newspapers give any clue, the play met with approval. There was, however, a feeling that Sheridan did not do full justice to “the most finished” comedy ever written by Fielding. Bensley and Parsons were admirable in their rôles; but on the whole the play was not so well cast as “The School for Scandal.” This disposition to criticise the manager concluded a notice in “The St. James’s Chronicle,” otherwise also most interesting as a comprehensive statement of the attitude of the audience towards the performance. Under the news from Drury Lane, we read there:

“Last Night a Comedy called *The Fathers*, or *The Good-natured Man*, was performed for the first Time at this Theatre. It was written by the late *Henry Fielding*, one of the first Geniuses that ever adorned this Island. Like Persons of that Order, in all Communities, where Abilities and Virtues are not the Instruments of Success, he was often involved in Difficulties, and has left a Family, for whose Advantage this Play is performed. This precludes all Censure of its Irregularities and Defects. Indeed this Reason is not necessary in the Case of the present Comedy. The opposite Dispositions of two Fathers, whose Families are inclined to unite, are delineated so exactly from Nature; the Sentiments of the Piece are so genuine; and the Dialogue so easy and witty, that it cannot fail of pleasing, if it be fairly and properly kept on the Theatre.

“The Comedy is not made the most of; the Strength of the House being reserved to insure the Success of more favourite Writers.”

The censure implied in the last paragraph was hardly

\* “*The Athenaeum*,” Feb. 1, 1890.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

deserved. Doubtless Sheridan did the best he could in the circumstances. According to the custom then prevailing, a comedy as well as a tragedy was always followed the same evening by a play in lighter vein. Besides Garrick's own "Irish Widow," the afterpieces to "The Fathers" were Dibdin's "Quaker," Colman's alteration of "Comus," various pantomimes, and "The Camp," a very popular medley based upon the romantic intrigues connected with the camp at Coxheath. Part of the company had to be reserved for these shows and entertainments; but in no instance, so far as I can see, did Sheridan neglect the main performance of the evening. The fact is, Fielding's comedy came into competition with "The School for Scandal." Excellent as it is in some of its scenes, it could not as a whole stand comparison with Sheridan's perfect art. The wonder is that it held the stage for nine nights.

On the day of the last performance, "The Fathers: or, The Good-Natur'd Man" was published as a pamphlet, selling at a shilling and sixpence. An advertisement to the reader, almost certainly from the pen of Sir John Fielding, relates how the play happened to be discovered, and attributes much of the applause with which it was received to "the very liberal and friendly assistance of Mr. Sheridan, and to the Prologue and Epilogue, written by Mr. Garrick."\* When was Sheridan not liberal! Altogether Mrs. Fielding should have realized two or three hundred pounds out of the entire transaction. A very appropriate dedication, likewise from Sir John, to the Duke of North-

\* Sir John Fielding's account of the discovery and performance of the play needs to be corrected and supplemented. See "The St. James's Chronicle," "The London Chronicle," "The Public Advertiser," and "Lloyd's Evening Post," for the period covered by the performance; Genest's "Some Account of the English Stage," VI, 77; Forster's "Goldsmit" as cited above; "The Private Correspondence of David Garrick," II, 318; "Appendix to the Second Report of the Historical MSS. Commission," 1871, p. 13; and Nichols's "Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century," especially VIII, 446.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

umberland, then Lord Lieutenant of the County of Middlesex, justly calls the attention of the public to the fact that Henry Fielding's work as justice of the peace, as well as his writings, still lived after him. "The author of this play," says the brother, "was an upright, useful, and distinguished magistrate for the County of Middlesex; and by his publications laid the foundation of many wholesome laws for the support of good order and subordination in this metropolis, the effects of which have been, and now are, forcibly felt by the public. His social qualities made his company highly entertaining. His genius, so universally admired, has afforded delight and instruction to thousands." At the same time, Garrick's prologue, reprinted with the epilogue everywhere in the newspapers, served to recall to memory a man of extraordinary talents,

Whom nature prompted as his genius writ,  
through a long succession of novels, essays, and plays.

As we ring down the curtain with the last words of Garrick on Fielding, we may well combine with them the words uttered long before by two other friends, of whom the one followed Fielding's career from a distance and the other knew him intimately in the last days. When Lady Mary Wortley Montagu heard of her cousin's death, nearly a year after it had occurred, she wrote to her daughter from Lovere:

"I am sorry for H. Fielding's death, not only as I shall read no more of his writings, but I believe he lost more than others, as no man enjoyed life more than he did, though few had less reason to do so, the highest of his preferment being raking in the lowest sinks of vice and misery. I should think it a nobler and less nauseous employment to be one of the staff-officers that conduct the nocturnal weddings. His happy constitution (even when he had, with great pains, half demolished it) made him forget every-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

thing when he was before a venison pasty, or over a flask of champagne; and I am persuaded he has known more happy moments than any prince upon earth. His natural spirits gave him rapture with his cook-maid, and cheerfulness when he was fluxing in a garret. There was a great similitude between his character and that of Sir Richard Steele. He had the advantage both in learning and, in my opinion, genius: they both agreed in wanting money in spite of all their friends, and would have wanted it, if their hereditary lands had been as extensive as their imagination; yet each of them [was] so formed for happiness, it is pity he was not immortal.”\*

Lady Mary was here describing Fielding as she remembered him when he first came upon the town out of the West. Of his great qualities of head and heart that developed with the passage of the heats of youth, she had no personal knowledge. She trusted too much to hearsay and was too fond of piquant phrases. It never dawned upon her that this man, who loved life more than most men, cheerfully sacrificed it in the service of his country, raking through those “lowest sinks of vice and misery.” But all that escaped her was seen clearly by Christopher Smart, whom Fielding befriended in the poor poet’s dark days. What Smart saw, he put into the following “Epitaph on Henry Fielding, Esq.”:

The master of the GREEK and ROMAN page,  
The lively scorner of a venal age,  
Who made the publick laugh, at publick vice,  
Or drew from sparkling eyes the pearl of price;  
Student of nature, reader of mankind,  
In whom the patron, and the bard were join’d;  
As free to give the plaudit, as assert,  
And faithful in the practise of desert.

\* “Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,” third edition, 1861, II, 282-283.

## LIBRARY AND MANUSCRIPTS

Hence pow'r consign'd the laws to his command,  
And put the scales of Justice in his hand;  
To stand protector of the Orphan race,  
And find the female penitent a place.  
From toils like these, too much for age to bear,  
From pain, from sickness, and a world of care;  
From children, and a widow in her bloom,  
From shores remote, and from a foreign tomb,  
Called by the WORD of LIFE, thou shalt appear,  
To *please* and *profit* in a higher sphere,  
Where endless hope, imperishable gain  
Are what the scriptures *teach* and *entertain*.\*

\* Smart, "Poems on Several Occasions," London, 1763, pp. 13-14.

## CHAPTER XXX

### SURVIVORS

A biography like a novel should contain, if it is to satisfy curiosity, some account of the minor characters. The summer Henry Fielding made the voyage to Lisbon, his sister Sarah, being also in ill health, went to Bath to drink the waters. Incidentally, this explains why there is no reference to her in the introduction to her brother's journal, and why she did not accompany him to Rotherhithe. A letter to Richardson from Bath, dated July 6, 1754,\* informs the great man that she is reading "Sir Charles Grandison" and discussing the hero and heroine of that famous novel with young ladies who come and sit with her on afternoons. A lady of quality, she hears, who is "the object of public admiration," prefers Sir Charles so far above all her suitors that she has retired for several evenings to the seclusion of her rooms in order to be alone with this ideal gentleman. The waters seem likely to work in Miss Fielding as "perfect a cure from diseases as an old woman can expect." In those days ladies grew old much faster than they do now; for Sarah was then only in her forty-fourth year. She was again at Bath in 1758. During this visit the Rev. Richard Graves dined with her several times at Ralph Allen's, and afterwards stated that the squire gave her an allowance of £100 a year.† Certainly she soon settled near Bath under Allen's protection, and he left her £100 in his will. It is a tradition that she—like

\* Barbauld, "Correspondence of Samuel Richardson," II, 68-70.

† R. Graves, "The Triflers," London, 1805, p. 77.

## SURVIVORS

her brother Henry formerly—lived at Widcombe Lodge below Prior Park. This tradition, as I have said earlier, cannot be confirmed; but certain considerations render it probable. The manor of Widcombe was then owned by Ralph Allen, who made over the stately mansion known as Widcombe House, long the residence of the Bennet family. The neighbouring cottage where Sarah Fielding is supposed to have dwelt, formed a part of the estate; it was really the old lodge of the manor house. Among her afternoon visitors in 1754, she tells Richardson, was a “Miss B—.” Very likely the manuscript of Sarah’s letter, if it were at hand, would give the name of her friend as Miss Bennet; and were the name written in full, it would be Anne Bennet, to whom, as well as to Sarah Fielding, the owner of the manor bequeathed £100. Probably the fact is that Allen permitted the Fieldings to occupy Widcombe Lodge whenever they so desired, and that it eventually became Sarah’s permanent home.

During her last years, Miss Fielding wrote a novel of slight importance called “The History of the Countess of Dellwyn” (1759), and translated from the Greek—with annotations by her old friend James Harris of Salisbury—“Xenophon’s Memoirs of Socrates” (1762), a piece of work which was rightly thought to do great “credit to her abilities, being executed with fidelity and elegance.”\* Very few women of the time could have made, I think, so good a translation of a Greek classic. Withal, it was a fitting book with which to close one’s literary career. Sarah Fielding died on April 9, 1768, and was buried five days later in the little stone church at Charlcombe, dedicated to St. Mary. It was the same church which Henry Fielding and Charlotte Cradock chose for their marriage. Near her grave, which is at the entrance of the chancel by the rector’s seat, a mural tablet bears the inscription:

\* J. Nichols, “Literary Aneadotes,” III, 385.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Esteemed and Loved

Near this Marble lies

Mrs. SARAH FIELDING

She died April the 9th 1768

Aged 60

How worthy of a nobler Monument

but her name will be found written

in the Book of Life.

Her age is given only approximately. She was really but in her fifty-eighth year. Subsequently another memorial to Miss Fielding was placed in the Abbey Church at Bath, for which Dr. John Hoadly, the bishop's son, wrote the epitaph. Here Miss Fielding's age is reduced to fifty-four, and her father's name appears as Henry instead of Edmund. But her clerical friend's ignorance of the details of family history did not prevent a just estimate of Miss Fielding's character:

Her unaffected Manners, candid Mind,

Her Heart benevolent and Soul resign'd

Were more her Praise, than all she knew and thought,

Though Athens' Wisdom to her Sex she taught.

Sir John Fielding maintained the prestige of the Bow Street court, carrying out his brother's plans for the suppression of crime, and imitating him in addresses and directions to the public. What those plans were he described in "A Plan for Preventing Robberies within Twenty Miles of London" (1755) and in "An Account of the Origin and Effects of a Police," or, to give the sub-title, "The History and Effects of the late Henry Fielding's Police" (1758). The second of these pamphlets he dedicated to the Duke of Newcastle, from whom he begged and three years later obtained the honour of knighthood.\* Like Henry, John did not escape the unjust charge of venality; nor did affairs always run smoothly between him and his patron. In bear-

\* Letter dated Dec. 12, 1757, British Museum, Additional MSS., 32876, f. 274.

## FRONTISPICE.



See here the JUSTICE and his Jovial Crew,  
With nought but Wit and rosy Mirth in View,  
Jeffs void of Blame and Wit without Offence;  
Such as our Lively Pages here dispense! —

Frontispiece to Sir John Fielding's Jests



## SURVIVORS

ing he was somewhat over-formal, and he wore his moral principles rather conspicuously. Always obstinate in his opinions, he became, with advancing years, irritable and difficult to deal with. But he was an honourable magistrate having the instincts of a gentleman. In MacArdell's mezzotint of the justice after a painting by Nathaniel Hone, he appears in velvet and lace, with his right arm resting on the Bible. It is a full, placid face indicating good nature but some pride and aloofness. Abundant hair falls in curls about the neck, and a black band across his forehead just above the eyes tells us that he was blind. His efficiency, despite his blindness, was perfectly marvellous. It is said that his ear became so acute in distinguishing tones, that he recognized people as readily by their voices as most men do by the sight. If he once heard a man speak, he always remembered him. At length the infirmities of age overcame him. He died at Brompton, near Chelsea, where he had resided for some years, on the evening of September 4, 1780, "after a long and painful illness, which he bore with the utmost patience."\* Subsequent to his death appeared a collection of *bons mots* entitled "Sir John Fielding's Jests." A frontispiece represents him sitting at the head of a table at the Bedford Arms in the company of the wits of bygone days. Pope is on his left; and further down the table, Henry Fielding, with Swift by his side, is reading from one of his books. All are drinking punch. The picture is wholly fanciful, for none of the jests can be Sir John's. He was as deficient in humour as was Bishop Warburton. On the other hand, he possessed a shrewdness and practical sense which no one can claim in a high degree for Henry Fielding.

\* "Lloyd's Evening Post," Sept. 4-6, 1780. "The London Chronicle" for Sept. 5-7, 1780, has an eulogy on the late Sir John Fielding as "a consummate magistrate," who "was universally allowed to have had the head of a philosopher, the heart of a Christian, and the hand of a hero."

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Sir John's prudence, however, did not restrict his charities, the noblest of which was his conduct towards his brother's family. By his will Henry Fielding left his wife and children to the care of Ralph Allen, and it has been taken for granted that Allen assumed the burden. Ever since Fielding's death, statements to this effect have been very common; but they are quite misleading. John Fielding, as we have seen, administered his brother's estate in place of Ralph Allen, who had been named in the will as executor; and from the first he took the entire family under his protection. On this point we have positive evidence. Four years after her husband's death, Mrs. Fielding, who perhaps found the dependency irksome, applied to Lord Barrington, then Secretary of War, for a pension. As soon as John Fielding learned of the request, he wrote to his brother's old political friend:

“Bow Street Decemr the 16th

“. . . before I conclude this Letter I must beg leave to mention a circumstance that has given me some concern I find that my late Brothers Widow has applied to your Lordship for a thing which I have told her my Self was irregular and could not be granted but I assure you she did it without either my knowledge or consent least therefore your Lordships humanity should suffer from a supposition of her being in distress at present I thought it my Duty to say a word or two on that subject when my Brother died he left little more than would answer his just Debts and left a Widow and Four children one of which is since dead this Family I have taken to my self and hope from my own Labours so long as I shall live to support them handsomely and I do assure your Lordship that the tenderest regard is paid to their healths the exactest care taken of their Educations and the most unwearied diligence used by me to make her forget the loss of a Husband them of a Father nor has she or them been deny'd one Earthly

## SURVIVORS

thing in my Power Since my Brother's death but on the contrary I have told her, her Friends and all my acquaintance that so long as I have one Shilling in the world they shall have the same Share of it as if she was my own wife they my own Children doubtless as life is precarious and as their subsistence depends on mine it would make me very happy if she could obtain some certain establishment for her own Life but should be glad to be acquainted with the nature of her applications. I hope your Lordship will excuse this little piece of Family History from one who will always take a particular pride in approving himself

My Lord

Your Lordships most dutifull  
and the Publicks most faithfull H<sup>ble</sup> Serv<sup>t</sup>  
J FIELDING.\*\*

This letter should not be taken to nullify the direct statement of Arthur Murphy in his essay on Fielding that Ralph Allen for some time contributed annually "a very generous donation" towards the education of the children—perhaps as much as the £100 with which tradition credits him. On his death in 1764, Allen bequeathed that amount to each of the three children then living. The one who had died was Sophia. William and Allen Fielding also received legacies of £200 each from Andrew Millar, their father's publisher, who died in 1768; while Harriot, who was then dead, had been the companion of Elizabeth Chudleigh, the Countess of Bristol. The fact nevertheless remains that the responsibility for the support and education of the

\* London War Office. In "Letters, Miscellaneous," 1758, A to L. The letter is endorsed "Deer 1756," which is, as the contents show, the correct date. The main part of the letter consists of comment on the "Press Act," a copy of which Lord Barrington sent to Sir John Fielding for his criticism. This Act, called "An Act for the Speedy and effectual Recruiting of his Majesty's Land Forces and Marines," received the royal assent on May 27, 1756.—"Statutes at Large," VII, 625-631. Parts of the letter were published with incorrect date in "The Athenaeum" for Nov. 25, 1905.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

children was cheerfully borne by Sir John Fielding. Nor does what he did for them and their mother rest upon hearsay. In asking the Duke of Newcastle for his salary as justice of the peace, he wrote on September 29, 1757: "I hope your Grace will excuse my applying thus early for this money as I allow my late brother's widow & children one hundred pounds a year out of my salary, payable quarterly."\* Sir John conducted himself handsomely.

Sophia died too young to have any record left of her appearance and disposition; but a brief sketch has survived of Harriot. It comes, strangely enough, from the pen of a footman named Thomas Whitehead, formerly in the service of Evelyn Pierrepont, the second Duke of Kingston. After the death of his master, Whitehead became a musician at Bath; and having a facile and piquant style, he made use of it to relate his reminiscences in a little book entitled "Original Anecdotes of the late Duke of Kingston, and Miss Chudleigh, *alias* Mrs. Hervey, *alias* Countess of Bristol, *alias* Duchess of Kingston, interposed with Memoirs of several of the Nobility and Gentry now living." The date is 1792. When Miss Fielding associated with Miss Chudleigh, the real character of this woman had not been exhibited to the public view. Though some scandal attached itself to her name, she still maintained her position at Court; and her parties, the most lavish and splendid of the time, were attended by everybody fortunate enough to receive an invitation. Miss Chudleigh was, however, a woman of coarse and vulgar fibre. She privately married Augustus John Hervey, afterwards the Duke of Bristol, and kept the marriage a secret even from her most intimate friends. Everybody addressed her as Miss Chudleigh.

\* British Museum, Additional MSS., 32874, f. 379. Millar's will, proved June 17, 1768, is at Somerset House (P. C. C. 250, Secker). The substance of Allen's will, bequeathing £100 also to Sarah Fielding, is given in "The London Magazine," Aug., 1764, XXXIII, 426, and in R. E. Peach's "Historic Houses in Bath," second series, 1884, appendix, p. 149.

## SURVIVORS

Following a quarrel with her husband, she became the mistress of the Duke of Kingston, whom she subsequently married while she was still the wife of Hervey. The evidence of her first marriage coming out, she was brought before the House of Lords on a charge of bigamy and easily convicted of the crime; but she escaped the penalty of being burned in the hand by pleading the privilege of her peerage. Without other punishment, the Lords decided to leave her to her conscience to do the necessary work.

According to Whitehead, Miss Chudleigh became "very intimate" with Sir John Fielding at the time she was living with the Duke of Kingston after the separation from Hervey. "She and the duke," says the footman, "seldom missed the examination of any felon brought before the magistrate. Indeed Miss C.'s carriage and the duke's were as well known in Bow Street as any of Sir John's thief-takers. Even the coachmen were ashamed to attend them, waiting so many hours amongst a nest of thieves and thief-takers." Amid these scenes of crime, which Miss Chudleigh haunted out of a depraved curiosity, she discovered Harriot and took her home with her. The Duke of Kingston must have known Harriot ever since her childhood, for he was a distant cousin and an old friend of Harry Fielding. It was doubtless at his suggestion that Miss Chudleigh received her into her household. On one occasion, Harriot was invited to Pierrepont Lodge, the Duke's seat in Surrey, for the Christmas festivities presided over by Miss Chudleigh. It was a large party, consisting of many well-known people who amused themselves by dancing every night for an entire month. There Miss Fielding met "Colonel Montressor, Governor of Tilbury Fort"; he proposed to her; and she accepted him. In relating the incident, Whitehead gives us the little portrait of Harriot to which we have referred. "Miss Fielding," he says, "was of a good stature, about twenty years of age, a sweet

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

temper, and great understanding, but in a deep decline. She had been a visitor and companion to Miss C. for some years. Colonel Montressor, who was between fifty and sixty years old, paid his addresses to her, and in a few months afterwards they were married; which so displeased Miss C. that she never saw them after. If the colonel had not married her I believe she would never have got a husband; being, poor lady, the colour of a ghost—a mere skeleton.”\*

It is well to be on good terms with the servants, for they may, equally with the bards, save us from oblivion. But for a footman, there would have been no story to tell of Fielding’s daughter. It was a footman, too, who left the only account we have of Sterne’s death. The visit to Pierrepont Lodge must have been at Christmas in 1765. Harriot, who was then about twenty-eight years old, possessed in a degree that beauty and amiable disposition which distinguished her mother, the charming Charlotte Cradock of Salisbury. Withal, ample provision, we see, had been made for the cultivation of her mind. Her suitor was James Gabriel Montresor, a distinguished military engineer, who had designed some of the defences at Gibraltar, had surveyed Lake Champlain and its fortifications, and had built the roads for Braddock’s army over the Allegheny Mountains to Fort Duquesne. A son of Colonel Montresor, by a previous marriage, served with his father in America, and later became the chief engineer with Lord Howe’s army during the Revolution. It was this Captain John Montresor who extended unusual courtesies to Captain Nathan Hale on the morning of the latter’s execution. He took the young man into his tent, conversed with him, supplied him with materials for writing to his mother and a brother officer, and accompanied him to the

\* “Original Anecdotes,” p. 42; reprinted by C. E. Pearce in “The Amazing Duchess,” 1911, II, 75-76.

## SURVIVORS

place of execution. But for him there would be no authentic record of "the gentle dignity" with which Hale endured the ordeal. When the elder Montresor danced with Miss Fielding at the Duke of Kingston's, he had just passed the age of sixty-three. They were married on August 25, 1766; and four scant months later Mrs. Montresor was buried at St. James's Church, Westminster. The entry among the burials for 1766 is simply—

11 Dec. Harriot Montressor, W[oman].

Harriot was the only child of Henry and Charlotte Fielding to reach maturity. With her death that line became extinct. The two surviving sons were born of the second marriage. William, bred to the law, followed in the legal footsteps of his father. He entered the Middle Temple as a student on May 5, 1770, and was called to the bar there on November 22, 1776. He gained some eminence as a special pleader, and travelled for a time the Western Circuit with William Grant, who afterwards became chief justice of the court of common pleas, and master of the rolls. It was said by Lord John Russell, who may have remembered him, that "he had much of his father's wit, and was the delight of the circuit." But the promise of a brilliant career such as awaited his friend Grant, was cut short by a paralytic stroke when he was little more than thirty years old. Still, though nearly deprived of the use of one side of his body, he stuck to his profession and eventually became the chief police magistrate at the court in Queen's Square, Westminster. For twelve years he administered this office "with impartial ability" and with due consideration of the poor and unfortunate. He died at his post on October 1, 1820, in his seventy-third year, and was buried in St. Margaret's churchyard, Westminster. He left a widow and a son named William Henry, who apparently survived him for only a short period. Nearly all

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the scattered references to William Fielding are comments on his sense of humour. "He was allowed," according to the obituary notice in "The Gentleman's Magazine," "by those who knew him most, to have been one of the best conversational men in the country." It was even said of this son of Henry Fielding, that "in genius, imagination, and pleasantry, he was worthy of such a sire." Robert Southey, who tried to find out all he could about the novelist and regretted the loss of the correspondence which must have passed between him and Jane or Margaret Collier, once met William on a visit to London. Writing to Sir Egerton Brydges in 1830, he says: "I was introduced one day in St. James's Park to the Fielding of whom you give me so lively an anecdote. He was then a fine old man, though visibly shaken by time: he received me in a manner which had much of old courtesy about it, and I looked upon him with great interest for his father's sake: this must have been in 1817." At that time William was breaking down with gout and palsy; but like his father he bore all his infirmities in cheerful resignation. In William Fielding, great abilities—genius it may be—were weakened and rendered ineffective by the misfortune of disease.\*

His brother Allen—the infant that his father left behind when he set out for Lisbon—was educated at Oxford, graduating B.A. at Christ's Church on April 14, 1774. Subsequently he received from Oxford the degree of Master of Arts. Entering the church, he became Vicar of Shepherd's Well in Kent and later of St. Stephen's near Canterbury, where he was also master of East Bridge Hospital,

\* See especially "The Gentleman's Magazine," for Oct., 1820, Vol. XC, Pt. 2, pp. 373-374; "The Autobiography of Sir Egerton Brydges," London, 1834, II, 267-268; and "Correspondence of John, Fourth Duke of Bedford," edited by Lord John Russell, 1846, III, 411. On September 14, 1708, William Fielding qualified to take office as justice of peace for the county of Middlesex.—Record Office. Westminster Guildhall and County of Middlesex. Appointment Books of Justices of the Peace, 1804-1820, p. 47.

## SURVIVORS

formerly a lodging for pilgrims visiting the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, but long since converted into a school and retreat for the poor. On October 23, 1783, he married Mary Ann Whittingham, an adopted daughter of his uncle Sir John Fielding.\* With or near him lived his mother, Mary Daniel, who died at the age of eighty-one, and was buried at St. Stephen's on May 18, 1802. His own death occurred on April 9, 1823, three years after that of his wife. Of his character, it has been written by a member of the family: "Allen was greatly beloved by all, especially the little children." He left four sons, all of whom took orders in the Church of England. Concerning Charles, the second and most distinguished of them, it has been written much as of his father: "He had not only a heart that could feel for others, but a heart that lived in giving." From Allen's children have since sprung two other generations of churchmen and lawyers. His eldest son Henry (1786-1863) held for many years the vicarage of Blean, a country parish two miles from Canterbury. Of Henry's three sons, the eldest was named Allen (1828-1895), whose eldest son Henry (born 1861) is the present head of this branch of the family.† He is a lawyer of St. Brelade's, Canterbury.

It would be too curious to trace in the mixed blood of these descendants the character of the man who wrote "Tom Jones." Genius is rarely inherited; it is nature's gift in union with profound application, and the hard circumstances of life that force its expression. We may pity the misfortunes of Henry Fielding. Without them, his life would have been happier; without them he would have been, like many other members of his family, who came

\* Sir John Fielding was twice married, his second wife surviving him. No children were born of either marriage.

† For Fielding's later descendants, see "Burke's Peerage"; and J. E. M. Fielding, "Some Hapsburghs, Fieldings, Denbighs and Desmonds," privately printed, London, 1895. Mary Daniel's age and the date of her death as given here were taken from the parish registry of St. Stephen's.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

before and after him, a man of keen intelligence and a wit to delight his companions; he would have had a kind heart responsive to the affection of children and compassionate towards the poor in distress; but all that he was would have died with him; he would have written no books; the world would now know nothing of him.

## CHAPTER XXXI

### THE FAME OF FIELDING

THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

Misfortunes as great as any that encompassed Fielding in life, followed him into the land of immortality. When the twentieth century opened, few or none had any adequate conception of the immense range of his literary work. True, the biographers had referred to the four periodicals which Fielding conducted and to various pamphlets which were once attributed to him; but there is no evidence that anyone before Mr. Austin Dobson entered the field ever read them with any degree of care, and Mr. Dobson's acquaintance with them had obvious limitations. All of Fielding's productions outside the novels and a few miscellaneous pieces, it has been declared again and again, have no interest except that they came from the pen of Harry Fielding. They might have been written by any clever literary hack. The consequence is that the modern world has no reasonably complete edition of Fielding's works—not even, until now, has there been a respectable bibliography of them.\*


Concerning the major works which have been reprinted times almost without number, critics and other readers have expressed the most diverse opinions. Some have accorded them the highest praise; others have denounced them as a menace to public morals; still others have striven

\* Lawrence in his "Life of Fielding" has a "List of Fielding's Works," containing several titles not found in Murphy's volumes; and the so-called Henley edition of Fielding's works has an incomplete "Bibliographical List of the First Editions."

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

for the golden mean. Throughout the long controversy, extending through generations of men, the personal character of Fielding has suffered unmeasured injustice. Long ago the author of "Tom Jones" became an imaginary figure quite unlike what he really was. Not until these latter days has his genius surely won against the obstacles set in the path of his fame. It is the story of Fielding's fortunes and misfortunes since his death that I design to relate in concluding this biography. The narrative can be but a summary with few details.

At the very outset, Fielding was most unfortunate in having Arthur Murphy as his first editor. This young Irishman who had been assisted into periodical literature by the author of "The Covent-Garden Journal," was, so far as his nature would permit, an ardent admirer of Fielding, whom he regarded as his master. Subsequent to Fielding's death, he became an actor, and, failing in this profession, he met with some success in making over old plays for the theatres. He turned, for example, Fielding's "Coffee-House Politician" into a farce—called "The Upholsterer, or What News?"—which was brought out at Drury Lane for Mossop's benefit on March 30, 1757. It was a good farce superbly performed by Garrick and a company which included Mrs. Clive, Woodward, Palmer, and Mr. and Mrs. Yates. None the less, the piece was taken mostly from Fielding—from his comedy and from "Joseph Andrews." Mrs. Slipslop of the novel was transformed into Termagant, a shrew who mispronounces or disarranges her epithets, who has a fondness for "paradropsical" statements. Neither in the prologue nor anywhere else in the printed play, did the author acknowledge any indebtedness to Fielding. Near this time, Murphy applied for admission as a student at the Middle Temple, but was refused on the ground that he was an actor, though he later made his way into Lincoln's Inn. Fielding gone, he trans-



Engraved by Ridley from an Original Picture by Nath<sup>l</sup>. Dance Esq.  
Painted in the Year 1786.

Arthur Murphy Esq<sup>r</sup>



## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

ferred his affections to Dr. Johnson, whom he sought to please by his flattery. As he grew older, his character, always weak, rapidly degenerated. It was said that he borrowed money which he never repaid, and ate himself out “of every tavern from the other side of Temple-Bar to the west end of the town.” This is the man, not yet in his full moral decline, whom Millar employed as the most available person to select and edit the works of Mr. Fielding with a suitable memoir.

Murphy’s edition of “The Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.” appeared in May, 1762. The collection was issued simultaneously in two styles. There were four quarto volumes in gilt for gentlemen who wished to adorn their libraries; there were eight octavo volumes, well bound, with gilt edges also, for people who wished to read the books. Both sets had Hogarth’s frontispiece. The publisher, who knew his business, thus treated the memory of Fielding handsomely. But the editor, though his intentions were good, was thoroughly incompetent. He put in, of course, the novels and other long narratives; he put in, of course, the plays in their revised forms, several of which continued to delight audiences at all the theatres. To his credit, he printed “*Amelia*” from the author’s revised copy, and gave us the true “*Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*.”

Here praise must end. Murphy had at hand Fielding’s periodicals, his social and political pamphlets, and his verse. From “*The Covent-Garden Journal*,” he selected twenty-six of the seventy-two leaders; from “*The True Patriot*” ten out of thirty-three; from “*The Jacobite’s Journal*” only two out of forty-nine; and from “*The Champion*” none at all, assigning as his reason that Fielding’s contributions could no longer be ascertained, though in fact most of them were marked by letters adopted by the author for the very purpose of identification. Instead of bringing together, as he might have easily done, these

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

papers from "The Champion," which gave Fielding a "reputation" in his early days, Murphy merely expressed regret for their omission. Of the poems, he worked "An Epistle to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Walpole" into his introductory essay, but discarded all the rest on the ground that they were hastily written and displayed little or no poetic talent. Of the pamphlets, we miss several which appeared under Fielding's own name, such as "Bosavern Penlez," "Elizabeth Canning," "The Detection and Punishment of Murder," and "An Effectual Provision for the Poor." All the anonymous tracts, though Fielding acknowledged the authorship of some of them, went by the board. So, too, the "Preface" to the "Miscellanies," which next to "The Voyage to Lisbon" contains more direct autobiography than anything else that Fielding ever wrote. All these pieces were omitted by Murphy, "not being deemed of a colour with works of invention and genius," however much they might do honour to Fielding the man and magistrate.

Thus disfigured, Fielding's works were given over to posterity. For more than a century, editors and publishers followed, either directly or indirectly, the selection made by Murphy with little or no discrimination wherever he was called upon to use his judgment. In the numerous reissues of Murphy's volumes, there were naturally some variations. In 1783, Murphy himself found a place for "The Fathers" in a new edition that came out that year; and in 1806, the year after Murphy's death, Alexander Chalmers, a London journalist and biographer, added also "An Essay on Nothing." Since that time, all editions of Fielding have derived from Murphy through Chalmers. So far Fielding's works had usually been printed in eight or ten volumes. To make them more accessible to "the new world of readers" of 1840, Thomas Roscoe then compressed them into a single volume of eleven hundred pages,

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

with double columns and small type. Though Roscoe asserted that his edition comprised "the entire works of Fielding," it really contained nothing new beyond a few "specimens of the author's poems," which were given in an introduction. This heavy volume, many times reprinted, was the edition of Fielding most widely read by the Victorians before the appearance in 1871 of a handsome reprint of Chalmers in ten volumes, under the editorship of Dr. James P. Browne. Though Browne was not a great man, he did read some of Fielding's pamphlets and other pieces which Murphy had cast aside, with the result that he published in 1872 a supplementary volume entitled "Miscellanies and Poems by Henry Fielding, Esq." His additions comprised the cases of "Elizabeth Canning" and "Bo-savern Penlez," the "Preface" to the original "Miscellanies" and all the poems contained in that collection. In this Murphy-Chalmers-Browne edition, the best that had yet appeared, most people of the generation now passing have read their Fielding.

Then came, in 1882, Leslie Stephen with "The Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.," in ten sumptuous volumes. Notwithstanding claims made for this edition, it was based mainly upon its immediate predecessor. Still, the editor did show more respect for Fielding's periodicals than had ever been shown by anyone else. From the two volumes of essays reprinted from "The Champion" in 1741, Stephen selected fifty-nine of Fielding's contributions. Moreover, he actually examined the original folios of "The Covent-Garden Journal," from which he took eleven essays that had never before been reprinted, thus making available thirty-seven in all. Important as are these additions, they were made mechanically, without that critical sense for which Leslie Stephen was usually distinguished. "The True Patriot" and "The Jacobite's Journal" he left untouched; and ignored all the pamphlets not found in

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Browne. To say the truth, it was a capricious performance, quite unworthy of the name it bears.

Finally came, in 1903, sixteen volumes called "The Complete Works of Henry Fielding, Esq." This compilation is known as the Henley edition, because the late W. E. Henley contributed to the last volume a brilliant critical essay superseding all recent estimates of Fielding. Mr. Henley, however, cannot be held responsible for the editorial work, all of which was performed by other hands without his guidance. In only one respect is Henley's edition inferior to Stephen's, on which it was founded. It reprints from Austin Dobson the mutilated version of "A Voyage to Lisbon," as if that were the better one because it was supposed to be the earlier. In all other respects Henley's edition is superior to Stephen's. Here were restored to Fielding, on the suggestion of Professor Lounsbury, ten pieces which had been hitherto neglected. They comprise poems, pamphlets, and the contributions which Fielding made to the body of his sister Sarah's "Familiar Letters." Nevertheless, the title which this edition bears is a misnomer; it does not contain "the complete works" of Henry Fielding. A reader will look in vain in those volumes for a number of items described in this biography. He will find, for example, none of the pamphlets which Fielding put forth during the Jacobite insurrection. "A Serious Address to the People of Great Britain" is not there; nor "A Dialogue between a Gentleman of London and an Honest Alderman"; nor "A Dialogue between the Devil, the Pope, and the Pretender." Of all these anonymous pamphlets Fielding declared himself the author. A greater defect still of the Henley edition was the failure to add a single periodical essay to those given by Stephen. Over this as well as over all other editions of Fielding's works hangs the shadow of Arthur Murphy; it has partially lifted but it is still there.

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

It would be a mistake to overestimate the literary value of those works which have not yet been collected. The best of Fielding we have, it goes without saying, in his novels and the other narratives which the world has long known. Still, how great the loss has been became apparent recently when Mr. Jensen published from the original folios all the leading articles of "The Covent-Garden Journal." Doubtless to the surprise of many, essays were discovered there as fine as any of the initial chapters of "Tom Jones." Equally rich treasures lie embedded in "The Champion," "The True Patriot," and "The Jacobite's Journal." Of all the periodicals, the most interesting is "The Champion." It would be but a simple act of justice to collect and arrange in chronological order all of Fielding's productions. Though the result might not materially enhance his literary fame, it would modify the traditional views of his character. A biography of Fielding may show that he was a man of action as well as a man of letters; it may cast discredit upon many stories that have been told to his dishonour; but a really complete edition of his works would speak more directly, more convincingly, than a book written about Fielding. The first questions which a reader of that complete edition would put to himself would be: "How could the self-indulgent Fielding of tradition, dead before he was fifty years old, have accomplished so much; how could he have acquired, amid those 'wild dissipations' to which Murphy refers, so vast a learning; how is it that his energy never flagged; how is it that he kept his pen ever going?" Suspicion would be inevitable that something is the matter with tradition.

Incompetent as was Murphy as an editor, he was a much worse biographer. "An Essay on the Life and Genius of Henry Fielding, Esq.," which he prefixed to his edition of the author's works, is a curious production. Murphy is probably the only biographer who ever set out with the

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

intention of relating no incidents in the life of his subject, assigning as the reason a desire not "to disturb the Manes of the dead." In accordance with this design, he gave in his entire essay but two dates, one of which is exact and the other only approximate. He says that Fielding was born on "April 22, 1707," and died "in the year 1754." That is all. No one but an Irishman would have called the essay a life. The truth is, Murphy's aim was to display himself on Fielding as a background in the manner of Joseph Warton, who had published, not long before, the first volume of "An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope." Murphy defines genius, telling us just what part is played by invention and just what part by judgment, and then briefly illustrates his definition by references to Fielding. He describes the Middle Comedy and the New Comedy in Greek literature, and draws the proper analogies between them and the plays which Fielding wrote for the Little Theatre in the Haymarket. He examines the ancient epics, and shows how profitably Fielding's novels may be studied in their light, for Fielding as well as Homer and Virgil paid due regard to "the fable" or "the action," to "manners," "sentiments," and "style." From this discussion "Tom Jones" emerges as the Iliad of the modern novel, and "Amelia" as the Odyssey. The conclusion, which is quite correct, does not appear, when taken by itself, to be very illuminating.

Not all that Murphy said of Fielding's work was expressed in these formal phrases of Aristotle and Longinus. He had his own formal phrases, similes, and analogies, several of which have entered into traditional criticism and appreciation of Fielding. The plays, though they occasionally exhibit "the talent of a master," failed as a whole according to Murphy, not because Fielding lacked dramatic talent; it was partly because he let his wit run away with his judgment, but mainly because he did not expend enough

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

time and care upon them. So they may be neglected as the offspring of haste and indigence. This easy disposal of “Pasquin,” “Tom Thumb,” and the rest cleared the way for an approach to the novels. To Murphy we are indebted for the comparison between the flow of incident in “Tom Jones” and the flow of a stream—a simile which Scott appropriated as I have elsewhere quoted him. The course of “Tom Jones,” said Murphy, is “like a river, which in its progress, foams amongst fragments of rocks, and for a while seems pent up by unsurmountable oppositions; then angrily dashes for a while, then plunges under ground into caverns, and runs a subterraneous course, till at length it breaks out again, meanders round the country, and with a clear, placid stream flows gently into the ocean.” Regarded as a whole, Fielding’s career as novelist was likened to the journey of the sun through the heavens on a bright summer’s day. This figure required for its elaboration the following paragraph:

“In the progress of Henry Fielding’s talents, there seem to have been three remarkable periods; one, when his genius broke forth at once, with an effulgence superior to all the rays of light it had before emitted, like the sun in his morning glory, without the ardour and the blaze which afterwards attend him; the second, when it was displayed with collected force, and a fulness of perfection, like the sun in meridian majesty, with all his highest warmth and splendour; and the third, when the same genius, grown more cool and temperate, still continued to cheer and enliven, but shewed at the same time, that it was tending to its decline, like the same sun, abating from his ardour, but still gilding the western hemisphere.”

Morning, noon, and evening, it was explained, have their correspondences in Fielding’s three novels taken in order—“Joseph Andrews,” “Tom Jones,” and “Amelia.” After them came the twilight of Fielding’s genius in “A

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

*Voyage to Lisbon*,” wherein “the last gleams of his wit and humour faintly sparkled.” At last the evening twilight passed into total darkness. Fielding died, in short. The same conclusion was reached with a parallel drawn between the growth and decay of a man’s body and his faculties. When the body weakens, the faculties weaken also, and an “*Amelia*” must succeed a “*Tom Jones*.” These two similes of Murphy’s, generally somewhat mixed, have supplied the framework for many an essay on Fielding down to the present day. They would be more applicable to a writer who lived to a greater age. As Fielding died in middle life, there was no decline, corresponding to physical decline, in his faculties. There were only those altered views of art and life which come to every man with experience.

Half the space which Murphy gave to rhetorical display would have been enough for a concise statement of the main facts in Fielding’s life from boyhood to death. For such a biography, as he says himself, information could have been readily obtained. His phrase is a “prodigious number of materials.” Fielding’s sister, brother, and widow were still living; and they had, taken together, all the family history. Allen and Lyttelton and Garrick were still living. They were his most intimate friends; and together they knew all the details of his literary career. They knew, too, the heart of the man. Besides all these, there were the bench and the bar, Andrew Millar, and many others who could have told Murphy the truth about Fielding. His claim that he consulted “the ablest and best of the author’s friends,” is not borne out, except in the most restricted sense, by an examination of his essay. From John Fielding he learned that Henry left behind manuscripts on Crown Law; either John or another member of the family placed at his disposal the revised “*Amelia*.” Some one of them gave him the date and supposed place of Henry’s birth, the

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

name of his first wife, and the names of General Fielding's children, with incidental information. From Hogarth he may have derived the story which he tells of Fielding's portrait. Warburton and Lyttelton he quoted only at second hand and Allen not at all.\* Facts he despised unless they were capable of embroidery. In short, his aim was a striking portrait without too strict a regard to truth.

For such a portrait, Murphy had but to revise one that already existed in popular imagination. Fielding became, so to speak, a traditional figure before his death. Innumerable stories to the detriment of his character were put into circulation by his political and literary enemies. For these tales they drew largely from his own writings. Many of the plays and all the novels took the reader into low life among people guilty of crime and all sorts of moral offences. Sex instinct was often perverted or subject to no control. Moreover, whether it be a farce, a comedy, or a novel, Fielding's manner was always realistic. He seemed to belong to the very life which he described; not merely to know it, but to be it. To this impression force was given by personal allusions and by the complete absorption of himself in his characters. When hardly more than a boy, he wrote as if he were the young Wilding of "The Temple Beau" and the Luckless of "The Author's Farce"; and in the poems which he then addressed to Sir Robert Walpole he was the poor poet starving in a garret besieged by creditors. Subsequently all the follies and vices of Mr. Wilson, Tom Jones, and Captain Booth were transferred to him. Into his life must have come a Lady Bellaston, a Miss Mathews, and numerous other accidental women. As the

\* Warburton's remarks occur in a footnote on the progress of romance, in his edition of Pope's "Works," 1751, IV, 169. After saying that the French transformed the old romance into the modern novel, Warburton adds: "In this species of writing, Mr. De Marivaux in France, and Mr. FIELDING in England stand the foremost. And by enriching it with the best part of the *Comic* art, may be said to have brought it to its perfection."

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

protagonist in "A Journey from this World to the Next," did he not actually confess to the free indulgence in wine and women? He was even identified with Jonathan Wild as if he had been in his youth a pickpocket or a receiver of stolen goods. Fielding suffered terribly from the realism and the novelty of his art. It was not always understood even by the most candid realers unless they were personally acquainted with him. This could have happened only in an age when the novel was in its beginning—never in an age such as our twentieth century.

In fact Fielding's art, despite its autobiographic elements such as I have attempted to point out earlier in this book, was essentially dramatic. One never has with certainty Fielding himself except in those works where he speaks directly—in the "Preface" to the "Miscellanies" and in "A Voyage to Lisbon." No such considerations, however, were ever countenanced by Fielding's enemies. As soon as he entered the political arena with his periodicals, came the deluge of abuse. Not only was he in turn every bad character in his works, but the bad qualities of them all were combined by his enemies into an immoral monster which they labelled Henry Fielding. He might protest, as he often did, against this usage, but it was in vain. He was described as ill-natured and quarrelsome; he was a "broken wit," a sponger on the great, a shifty politician ready to write on either side for money, a rake, a libertine, and a corrupt justice.

Perhaps no one ever really believed all this calumny hurled against Fielding in the heat of party strife by opponents whom he lashed into fury by his pitiless scorn and irony; but he could not escape the immense damage that these men did to the popular estimate placed upon his personality and character. "There is no abuse," Hazlitt once remarked, "so foul . . . but some part of it will stick. Ill words break the charm of good deeds. Call a man names

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

all the year round, and at the end of the year (for no other reason) his best friends will not care to mention his name. It is no pleasant reflection that a man has been accused, however unjustly, of a folly or a crime. We involuntarily associate words with things; and the imagination retains an unfavourable impression long after the understanding is disabused.”\* Literary history has no better example of Hazlitt’s observation than the case of Henry Fielding. Hurd, who met him in illness, described him as “a worn-out rake.” Edward Moore, who sometimes spent an evening with him, took it for granted that his gout was the result of “intemperance.” Smollett and Lady Mary, neither of whom had ever seen the second Mrs. Fielding, called her “a cook-maid”; and Horace Walpole, on the authority of Rigby, gave her a worse name, because she was seated at a table with Henry Fielding. They were all only repeating what the newspapers had said many times over. Murphy knew more than they of Fielding, incomplete as that knowledge was. His acquaintance with him began after that dangerous illness which followed the publication of “Tom Jones”; he was a witness of the vicious attacks upon Fielding while conducting “The Covent-Garden Journal”; and he was aware that they proceeded from malice and envy. But Fielding’s early career was a blank to him; and for that he depended, like others of his time, upon hearsay. It was doubtless to Fielding’s advantage that his biography was written some years after his death, when the harsher lines in his portrait were less insisted upon, when the notion that Fielding was a reprobate was yielding to the view of him as a great genius addicted to follies more than to positive vices. In this milder atmosphere, Murphy sat down to his essay on Fielding. The old phantom, however, intruded upon Murphy’s vision, and it has intruded upon the vision of all his successors.

\* Hazlitt, “Works,” edited by Waller and Glover, 1904, XII, 371.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

As he was bound to do, Murphy struck at the phantom with the declaration that Fielding's enemies always began with some misrepresentation or some discolouring of facts, and then from these really false premises drew, with pretended reluctance, conclusions "to the utter destruction of his moral character." It is not true, he says, that Fielding was a corrupt justice; and "though disposed to gallantry by his strong animal spirits, and the vivacity of his passions, he was remarkable for tenderness and constancy to his wife, and the strongest affection for his children." Instead of quarrelling with his father as was sometimes charged, "he . . . was never wanting in filial piety, which, his nearest relations agree, was a shining part of his character." His good nature, wit, and humour made for him friends everywhere. Himself firm and sincere in all his private attachments, he was grieved when anyone in whom he placed his trust proved a dissembler. He was kind and generous. Neither in his life nor in his works did he ever betray the interests of virtue and religion. Though his career was attended by disappointments, sickness, poverty, and bereavements, they could not subdue him; on the contrary, difficulties "only rouzed him to struggle through them with a peculiar spirit and magnanimity." "In short," says Murphy in his summary, "our author was unhappy, but not vicious in his nature; in his understanding lively, yet solid; rich in invention, yet a lover of real science; an observer of mankind, yet a scholar of enlarged reading; a spirited enemy, yet an indefatigable friend; a satirist of vice and evil manners, yet a lover of mankind; an useful citizen, a polished and instructive wit; and a magistrate zealous for the order and welfare of the community which he served."

It is to Murphy's honour that he removed several false imputations against the character of Fielding. But by that peculiar psychology which, with rare exception, has always

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

been applied to Fielding, Murphy eventually turned most of his virtues into imperfections, follies, and vices. Nor was he at all troubled by contradictory statements in different parts of his essay, provided his rhetoric satisfied him. Though learned, we are told, Fielding's mind was never properly disciplined by severe study. This is said of a man whose works from the very beginning of his career give evidence of that wide reading which afterwards became vast. It is doubtful if Eton had ever sent out a boy with a better knowledge and appreciation of the classics. Fielding appears in Murphy's essay as both "patient" and "impatient" of disappointments. He was "above passionate attacks" on his enemies and at the same time harsh and severe towards them. He was both good-natured and "unhappy"—that is, peevish—in temper. His generosity, praiseworthy in itself, led him into "imprudence" and "prodigality." He squandered both his own patrimony and his wife's fortune. Having exhausted his finances, he lost that high sense of honour which he displayed when he had money in his pocket, and wrote anything that he could in the course of a few hours, in utter contempt of what the public might think of it. At one time it was a play; at another time it was a pamphlet or a newspaper. His social qualities "brought him into high request with the men of taste and literature, and with the voluptuous of all ranks." With these men he wasted time that might have been better employed in his profession and "launched wildly into a career of dissipation." At length "excesses of pleasure" and "midnight watchings" ruined the robust constitution with which nature endowed him.

Such was the portrait of Fielding as redrawn by his first biographer. Relieved of all the darker vices, Fielding appears as a man of follies which should be lamented rather than condemned, a man of quick sensations which his will was not strong enough to control. The revised portrait

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

is nevertheless quite impossible. So long as Murphy relied on his personal knowledge, he wrote with a sure hand; he knew what he was about when he resented with spirit the aspersions cast upon Fielding's character. But in place of the old malicious stories, he substituted a collection of lighter anecdotes which he had heard of Fielding's younger days. Around a personality out of the ordinary run piquant anecdotes always gather. They may bear some slight relation to truth, or they may bear none at all; their interest lies in the fact that they reflect the popular conception of the man about whom they are related. They should never be admitted into a biography without stating precisely what they are. Murphy's method was just the reverse of this. His anecdotes all belong to the earlier part of Fielding's career about which he knew nothing and about which he took no pains to discover the facts. He dressed them up with details having the appearance of truth and then proceeded to base upon them the story of the wild and dissipated career of an unlucky author.

Several of these anecdotes were employed by Murphy, in combination with reckless statements, to illustrate the rapidity with which hunger and thirst drove Fielding's pen. "Tho' such a writer as Mr. Congreve," we are told, "was content in his whole life to produce four comedies and one tragedy, yet the exigence of our author's affairs required at his hand no less than eight entire plays, besides fifteen farces, or pieces of a subordinate nature," most of which were the work of six or seven years. A less number, it is implied, would have meant starvation. "Pasquin" especially, Murphy says, "came from the pen of an author in indigence." This example is the very worst that Murphy could have chosen for his purpose. As a matter of fact Fielding was at the height of his dramatic fame when he wrote "Pasquin." The play ran for more than sixty nights. Mrs. Charke, who was in the original cast, afterwards

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

referred to that season as the most prosperous in her career. It may be assumed that Fielding, the manager of the company, shared in the profits which he dispensed, to say nothing of his numerous benefit nights. Yet Murphy will have it that Fielding derived from his plays "but small aids towards his subsistence." From "our Author's own account," the biographer adds, Fielding received hardly fifty pounds for "The Wedding Day"; but he fails to state that this comedy was among Fielding's least successful pieces. The truth is that Fielding, between the ages of twenty-three and thirty, put on the stage a full score of plays. Some were damned; others were immensely popular. With their success and failure, he experienced, perhaps in an unusual degree, the ups and downs of a practising dramatist. He nevertheless supported himself and was able to marry.

If his pockets ran empty, the young playwright, says Murphy, "would instantly exhibit a farce or a puppet-show in the Haymarket theatre, which was wholly inconsistent with the profession he had embarked in." Of this statement every phrase is untrue. Fielding never produced a puppet-show. Apparently Murphy had in mind "The Author's Farce," to which was attached "A Puppet-Show, called the Pleasures of the Town." The continuation, however, was not a puppet-show except in name; it was a satire on the reigning follies. The profession to which Murphy refers was the law. Fielding's so-called puppet-show was first performed at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket in March, 1730; he entered upon the study of law in November, 1737, and was admitted to the bar in June, 1740. Subsequently two old plays—a comedy and a farce—which had never been performed were brought out for him at Drury Lane. That is all the connection Fielding had with the stage, except as its critic, after he took up his new pro-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

fession. He avoided the very inconsistency with which his biographer charged him.

“When he had contracted,” asserts Murphy, “to bring on a play, or a farce, it is well known by many of his friends now living, that he would go home rather late from a tavern, and would, the next morning, deliver a scene to the players written upon the papers which had wrapped the tobacco, in which he so much delighted.” Three mornings, it is added, were generally sufficient for a farce. If Murphy had considered this anecdote, he would have seen that it attributed to Fielding a physical impossibility. No man who ever lived could have written in three mornings any one of Fielding’s plays except “Eurydice Hiss’d” or “Phaeton in the Suds”; and those pieces are not plays; they are only brief dramatic entertainments. No man who ever lived could have smoked in three mornings enough tobacco to supply the wrappers necessary to the feat; for a play of average length it would have meant, according to a calculation made by Mr. Dickson, nearly two hundred pipes each morning. This is the humorous way he makes it out: “Two ounces of tobacco can be properly wrapped in a paper 8 x 8 inches. The tobacco will fill an ordinary pipe twenty-eight times. Fielding’s ordinary hand contained seven words to the square inch. The paper had sixty-four square inches, and so would contain 448 words to a side, or 896 words if written on both sides. ‘The Old Debauchees’ contains about 18,000 words; so it would require twenty packages to produce enough paper, even if written upon both sides, for this play, or a total of 560 pipefuls. As Fielding is reported to have taken but three days to produce some of his plays, he would be required to consume 186 pipefuls a day.” The shortest farce, I may add, that Fielding ever wrote would have required fifty pipes a morning, and the longest five or six times that number. Thirty-five or

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

forty pipes should be a good day's work for the hardest smoker.

His plays once written out under the inspiration of tobacco, Fielding could not be induced, it is said further, to alter them. This assertion Murphy illustrated by an anecdote concerning the first performance of "The Wedding Day," according to which Garrick pleaded with the author, while the play was in rehearsal, to omit a certain passage in his rôle, fearing that it would displease the audience. Fielding's answer was: "No, d-mn 'em; if the scene is not a good one, let them find *that* out." "Accordingly," says Murphy, "the play was brought on without alteration, and, just as had been foreseen, the disapprobation of the house was provoked at the passage before objected to; and the performer, alarmed and uneasy at the hisses he had met with, retired into the green-room, where the author was indulging his genius, and solacing himself with a bottle of champaign. He had by this time drank pretty plentifully; and cocking his eye at the actor, while streams of tobacco trickled down from the corner of his mouth, '*What's the matter, Garrick?*' says he, '*what are they hissing now?*' 'Why the scene that I begged you to retrench; I knew it would not do, and they have so frightened me, that I shall not be able to collect myself again the whole night.' '*Oh! damn 'em,*' replies the Author, '*they HAVE found it out; have they?*'" It is not explained how Fielding could chew tobacco and drink champagne simultaneously. That would have been a piece of dexterity worth seeing. The absurd anecdote obviously had its origin in a facetious prologue written and spoken by Macklin, in which Fielding is represented as drinking behind the scenes in order to brace himself against the possible failure of his comedy. It was all a jest which Murphy did not understand. Written before the first performance of the play, the prologue could not have described anything that

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

actually occurred on that night. Indeed, it is doubtful whether Fielding was in the green-room at all, for his wife was then very ill. So far as we know, the objections which were made to some passages in the comedy came, not from Garrick, but from the censor, all of which Fielding removed without remonstrance. If Garrick had fears for any part of the dialogue assigned to him, we may be sure that he struck it out on his own responsibility, for that was his way. The anecdote has not the slightest foundation in fact.

Because Fielding had a quick mind and a facile pen, Murphy jumped to the conclusion that he was a careless writer. There were times when Fielding was forced to let his work go before it completely satisfied him, but he was by instinct and training a thorough artist. A case in point is this very "Wedding Day," the story of which is told in that "Preface" to the "Miscellanies" which Murphy did not deign to reprint. Though the old comedy was acceptable to Garrick just as it stood, it appeared to Fielding to have so many faults that he resolved to expend upon its revision, not three mornings and the fumes of tobacco, but an entire week, working "night and day." Unfortunately the design was not carried out owing to Fielding's alarm over the grave condition of his wife. He postponed for another season what he was unable to do then. It was always Fielding's custom, whenever a play met with partial approval, to make it still better. Such, for example, was the history of "The Author's Farce" and of "Tom Thumb the Great." On some of the comedies—"The Modern Husband," for instance—he laboured, off and on, for months, and even then felt that he had not succeeded as well as he hoped. Other plays, like "Don Quixote in England," were laid by for years. In a word, Fielding's dramatic career gave him continuous practice in alterations and readjustments. The same artistic sense of course guided him in his novels and pamphlets. And yet, in the

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

face of Fielding's direct statement that "Tom Jones" cost him "some thousands of hours," Murphy implies that the novel was composed as a mere amusement while the author was administering justice at the Bow Street court and warning the public in pamphlets against crime. Fielding took the oaths as a justice of the peace for Westminster on October 26, 1748, and assumed the duties of his office six weeks later. "Tom Jones" appeared on the twenty-eighth of the following February. Hence the novel, according to Murphy, was composed and put through the press within the space of four months at the longest. This certainly would be rapid work requiring the stimulus of an immense amount of tobacco. Had Murphy cared to know the facts, he might have learned that two or three years were expended on that novel and that none of the legal pamphlets were written until months after its publication.

On a par with these absurdities is the story of the manner in which Fielding squandered his own and his wife's fortune. After his marriage to Miss Cradock, Fielding retired, says Murphy, to a farm at East Stour which "devolved to him" on the death of his mother "about that time." It was then, we are informed, Fielding's intention to bid farewell to the stage and all the follies of the town. "But unfortunately," Murphy goes on to say, "a kind of family-pride here gained an ascendant over him, and he began immediately to vie in splendour with the neighbouring country squires. With an estate not much above two hundred pounds a year, and his wife's fortune, which did not exceed fifteen hundred pounds, he encumbered himself with a large retinue of servants all clad in costly yellow liveries. For their master's honour, these people could not descend so low as to be careful in their apparel, but in a month or two were unfit to be seen; the squire's dignity required that they should be new-equipped; and his chief pleasure consisting in society and convivial mirth, hospital-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ity threw open his doors, and, in less than three years, entertainments, hounds and horses entirely devoured a little patrimony, which, had it been managed with oeconomy, might have secured to him a state of independence for the rest of his life."

An establishment such as Murphy describes in this passage would have been impossible at East Stour. Five or six servants, the number General Fielding employed when he held the estate, were quite sufficient to manage the farm and household. There were no neighbouring squires who lived in splendour. The rich man among them was a miser, and the rest were men of moderate means. All that Murphy says is fiction with just enough alloy of fact to give it the semblance of truth. Fielding had no fortune to waste. His allowance of £200 a year from his father had long since ceased, if indeed he ever received it. Nor had he yet come into possession of the annuities bequeathed to him and his wife by his uncle George, if indeed he ever came into possession of them. On the death of his mother in 1718, her estate at East Stour, valued at £150 a year, was placed in trust for the education of her children. As there were six of them, Henry's share was only £25 a year. Not "about that time," but nearly seventeen years later, on November 28, 1734, he married Charlotte Cradock, who by the death of her mother in the following February inherited a small fortune of uncertain amount. During two of the next three years when Murphy has him carousing at East Stour, he was manager of the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, presenting "Pasquin" and "The Historical Register" to crowded houses. For some time, Fielding had been spending a part of the intervals between the dramatic seasons at East Stour, which was his legal residence. This practice he probably continued after his marriage until the final disposal of the farm there in 1738, the year subsequent to the passage of the Licensing Act and his enrolment at the

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

Middle Temple. Neither his own nor his wife's estate was consumed in riotous living; they contributed to the support of his family while he was studying law; for this purpose the combined income proved inadequate and he was forced into journalism; he met the situation like a man.

But the hard facts of Fielding's life did not interest Murphy. So he put fiction in place of them. The main part of his story about Fielding the country squire was evidently taken from the account related in "Amelia" of Captain Booth's disastrous experiments in farming. Booth set up a coach which was his ruin. Hence Fielding must have done likewise with the same result. Other details, as was once pointed out by Leslie Stephen, were derived from a pamphlet on the career of a Robert Feilding, commonly known as "Beau Feilding" and "Handsome Feilding," a rake who survived from the reign of Charles the Second into that of Queen Anne. According to the old tales, this notorious namesake of a former age squandered his own and his wife's property; and becoming a justice of the peace for Westminster, he "hired a coach, and kept two footmen clothed in yellow," in order to awaken the curiosity of the crowd. It is difficult to believe that Murphy deliberately transferred this anecdote from one man to another. He probably had heard it told of Henry Fielding, and just took it because it enabled him to add one more touch to a vivid portrait. Fielding's great misfortune was not that his first biographer was positively dishonest; it was rather that he was a credulous blunderer of redundant imagination, ready to believe any story he heard and capable of adding to it fresh hues.

A number of anecdotes, similar to those which Murphy told, floated down the century and took lodgment in magazines, in gossipy biographies of various persons, and in collections such as John Nichols's monumental "Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century" and W. H. Pyne's

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“Wine and Walnuts,” published under the pseudonym of “Ephraim Hardcastle.” Most of these later anecdotes are so clearly apocryphal that it would be an insult to the intelligence of the reader to repeat them. There are, however, two which passed muster with Nichols and which on his authority have been generally accepted.

The first anecdote is a piece of conversation between Henry Fielding and the Earl of Denbigh of his time.

“ ‘Why is it, Harry,’ the Earl inquires, ‘that your branch of the family spells the name *Fielding*, whereas mine spells it *Feilding*.’

“ ‘I cannot tell, my Lord,’ answers Harry, ‘except it be that my branch of the family were the first that knew how to spell.’ ”

This is an excellent repartee, quite worthy of Fielding, and I have not hesitated to admit it earlier in this biography. Still, the conversation probably never took place. The story was told to Nichols by Dr. Kippis, who received it, as is usual in such cases, from another friend. The fact is that neither branch of the family had yet adopted an exclusive orthography. While Henry signed himself *Fielding*, his father and some of his cousins held to *Feilding*; and the book-plate of a preceding Earl of Denbigh, engraved in 1703, bears the name of Basil *Fielding*.

The second anecdote, which Nichols quoted from “The Gentleman’s Magazine” for August, 1786, was intended to illustrate Fielding’s generosity at the expense of his integrity. Fielding left unpaid, it is said, for a long time, the parochial taxes due on his house in Beaufort Buildings in the Strand. One day the collector appeared and told him that there could be no further procrastination. Seeing the visitor meant business, Fielding had recourse to Tonson the bookseller, who gave him ten or twelve guineas in advance payment on a book or pamphlet which he agreed to write for him. On the way home with the cash, he fell in

## THE SHADOW OF ARTHUR MURPHY

with an old school friend who was completely strapped, and took him to a neighbouring tavern for dinner. There they sat and talked together of old times through most of the night. When Fielding heard the pitiful tale of his friend's distresses, he concluded that his own were as nothing when compared with them, and in quick response to his emotions emptied all the gold he had received from Tonson into the poor gentleman's pocket. A little before dawn, Fielding parted with his nameless friend and set out towards home, "greater and happier than a monarch," where he was greeted by his sister Sarah, who told him that the collector had twice called since he left and was insistent upon the immediate payment of the taxes. "Friendship," replied Harry, "has called for the money and had it;—let the collector call again."

It is never safe to put into an anecdote so many details as we have here. The only period when Sarah Fielding could have been managing her brother's household was between the death of his first wife and his second marriage; that is, between November, 1744, and November, 1747. Neither then nor at any other time did he publish through Tonson. Nor did he ever, so far as can be ascertained, have a house in the Beaufort Buildings, now the site of Savoy Court leading to the Savoy Hotel, where a tablet commemorates the place of Fielding's supposed residence. Still, it was not until recently that the legend was completely exploded.\* Mr. J. Paul de Castro, a London barrister, in following up a piece of litigation in which Fielding was involved in 1745 as surety and counsel, discovered, as I have already related, that he was then living in Old Boswell Court in the parish of St. Clement Danes. An examination of the original rate-books of the parish, made by Mr. de Castro, shows that Fielding regularly paid his taxes—either quarterly or semi-annually according to the needs

\* "Notes and Queries," 12 S. I, 264 (April 1, 1916).

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

of the parish. These Fielding entries begin in the last quarter of 1744 and terminate in the last quarter of 1747; in other words, they exactly cover the period from the death of Charlotte Fielding to his marriage with Mary Daniel, when he took a house at Twickenham. The overseers of the poor note in their “Accompts” that some of Fielding’s neighbours were in arrears, but his own name occurs nowhere in the list of these delinquents. Moreover, Fielding was regarded at that time as good for a bond of £400, which he paid when left in the lurch by Dr. Collier. Instead of failing to meet his obligations, he appears throughout all these transactions a man of strict integrity.

As in this case, Fielding anecdotes, when they can be thoroughly tested, almost always reverse the truth. On the whole, those which were fabricated by the popular imagination subsequent to Murphy’s biography are less worthy of credence than his, for in his there is sometimes a trace of fact. Fielding did indeed assist his friends, old and new, to the extent of his power; but he did not neglect his taxes. Nevertheless, all the anecdotes about Fielding, whatever their source, are essentially false. They have amused generations of readers who have supposed that they depicted the real characteristics of Fielding; whereas they depict his characteristics in distortion or not at all.

## CHAPTER XXXII

### THE FAME OF FIELDING

#### OLD CONTROVERSIES OVER FIELDING'S ART AND MORALITY

Except for anecdotes, very little purporting to give fresh information about Fielding found its way into print for many years after Murphy's performance. I do not mean that there was nothing. His brother John, on every occasion that offered, wrote of him as an upright judge; and Lyttelton, who also repelled attacks on his character, made a remark to James Beattie, author of "*The Minstrel*," which the poet happily recorded. In the course of a conversation, Beattie asked Lyttelton for particulars about Pope, Swift, and other wits whom he had intimately known, and then put some questions relating to the author of "*Tom Jones*." Quickly came the response: "Henry Fielding, I assure you, had more wit and humour than all the persons we have been speaking of put together."\* With more reserve wrote James Harris, who saw much of Fielding in London and Salisbury. This learned man, whom Dr. Johnson described as a prig and coxcomb, did not quite approve of Fielding's free association with people on the streets or in the shops—of his stopping to talk with mantua-makers or watermen, for example. Harris's reminiscent passage, from which I have already quoted phrases, is one of the latest that came from anyone who had actually talked and done business with Fielding. After remarking that "a witty friend of mine, who was himself a dramatic writer,

\* James Beattie, "*Dissertations, Moral and Critical*," 1783, p. 571.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

used pleasantly, tho' perhaps rather freely, to damn the man, who invented fifth Acts," Harris added in the formal style for which he was distinguished:

"So said the celebrated HENRY FIELDING, who was a respectable person both by Education and Birth, having been *bred at Eton School and Leyden*, and being lineally descended from an Earl of Denbigh.

"His JOSEPH ANDREWS and TOM JONES may be called *Master-pieces* in the COMIC EPOPEE, which none since have equalled, tho' multitudes have imitated; and which he was peculiarly qualified to write in the manner he did, both from his *Life*, his *Learning*, and his *Genius*.

"Had his *Life* been less irregular (for irregular it was, and spent in a promiscuous intercourse with persons of *all* ranks) his *Pictures of Human kind* had neither been so *various*, nor so *natural*.

"Had he possesst less of *Literature*, he could not have infused such a spirit of *Classical Elegance*.

"Had his *Genius* been less fertile in *Wit and Humour*, he could not have maintained that *uninterrupted Pleasantry*, which never suffers his Reader to feel fatigue."<sup>\*</sup>

There are also several facts and incidents to be discovered in unexpected places such as Wraxall's "Me-moirs"; they are of interest, but they rarely concern the personality of Fielding. Murphy, it was generally thought, had done his work well. His essay was reprinted, with numerous editions of Fielding, either in full or in abridgments made by hack-writers in the service of booksellers. Naturally his portrait of Fielding was more and more taken for granted as the novelist's friends one by one disappeared and his own figure receded into the past. Interest in Fielding the man, though it still continued, was subordinated for a time to interest in his works. Critics and moralists made them the subject of essays and lectures.

\* J. Harris, "Philological Inquiries," in "Works," 1781, III, 163-164.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

Aspirants for literary fame imitated them. His novels were translated into French, German, and other languages. People became warm over the question whether the laurel should go to Richardson, Fielding, or Smollett. This was the first period of Fielding's posthumous fame.

No controversy arose over Fielding's verse. Not only was none of it, except a bare specimen, reprinted by Murphy, but "The Monthly Review" assured the public that it had all "been disapproved by Mr. Fielding himself," as "crude and unfinished."\* Work thus doubly condemned by author and biographer was not likely to meet with much favour. In the circumstances, only the most curious would search for Fielding's poems in the old volumes of the "Miscellanies." Of course the author himself, though he put no high value upon his poems, never really "disapproved" of them, for he collected and edited most of them. Time has since quietly done him ample justice. It is now agreed that Fielding, as he himself well knew, was not a poet, but that he was a light and graceful versifier, becoming heavy when he became serious. The late Frederick Locker-Lampson included in his anthology of society verse called "Lyra Elegantiarum" the two epistles to Sir Robert Walpole, the lines on a halfpenny, and one of the Celia poems. No other selection from Fielding would have been quite so suitable for such a volume. "The Roast Beef of Old England" is certain of a long life. It is something to have fixed in the language an old song like that.

Nor was the controversy very spirited over the plays, for Murphy's opinion was in harmony with the general view. Several of them continued to delight audiences every year. Goldsmith, who saw "The Miser" and "The Mock Doctor" in 1759, was generous in his praise of the manner in which the leading parts were performed.† These two

\* "The Monthly Review" for May, 1762, XXVI, 365.

† "Remarks on the Theatres," in "The Bee."

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

comedies and “The Intriguing Chambermaid” and “Tom Thumb” survived the eighteenth century; but the prevailing opinion was that most of Fielding’s other plays belonged to the past—to the freedom of speech and ridicule which characterized the period before the Licensing Act, for the passage of which he was held responsible. They had to be made over for the new age. Accordingly, as we have seen, Murphy set to work on “The Coffee-House Politician”; and even before Fielding’s death, his friend Dr. Benjamin Hoadly drew from his “Temple Beau” for “The Suspicious Husband.” A scrutiny of the drama for the fifty years after Fielding’s death would reveal a very free use of hints and scenes from his plays.\* In 1772, Dr. Arne, who in his youth had assisted in transforming “Tom Thumb” into a comic opera, wrote the music and perhaps the words of “Squire Badger,” drawn from “Don Quixote in England.” The burletta (as it was called) was performed at the Haymarket theatre, and subsequently revived, with alterations, under the title of “The Sot.” Both were in verse. In 1773, William Kenrick, Fielding’s old enemy, purloined a play called “The Duellist” from “Amelia,” the very novel he had once outrageously ridiculed. His production reached the stage only to be hissed off by an angry audience. On the other hand, Kane O’Hara made a lucky hit in 1780 with a new burletta founded upon “Tom Thumb.” It had a first run of fifteen nights. Doubtless O’Hara’s songs added to the entertainment, but he made only one alteration in the plot. Instead of all the characters being slain or poisoned for good in the last scene, Tom Thumb leaps from the cow’s mouth at the command of Merlin, and all the dead are restored to life. Following the first night, “The London Chronicle” pronounced the original play “the best and most successful dramatic ridicule that ever appeared on the stage.” “The burlesque,” it went on to say, “is

\* For several of these plays not mentioned here, see the bibliography.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

more genuine than in any other production of the kind, because the ridicule is invariably levelled against actual defects in dramatic composition. . . . The humour of it is also infinitely more natural and easy, as was sufficiently proved by the unceasing laugh which it produced through the whole of its performance.”\* “Tom Thumb,” we see, still exerted upon the audience the old power which it had when Swift laughed for the second time in his life; but it was necessary to adjust it to new dramatic conditions.

“Pasquin,” too, was relished at that time. This piece of dramatic satire had not been performed, I think, since the passage of the Licensing Act; but it was still read. Joseph Warton thought it “an admirable picture” of the folly and meanness of an election canvass, containing amid much trash “the truest humour.”† One day Fanny Burney and her father, a little wearied by reading aloud the sentimental and elegant Berquin, had recourse to “Pasquin,” she says, “to put us in better spirits. And so we laughed.” As Miss Burney discovered, neither “Pasquin” nor any other of Fielding’s satires is quite suitable to the family circle. She very properly remarks: “I must own I too frequently meet with disgust in all Fielding’s dramatic work, to laugh with a good heart even at his wit, excellent as it is; and I should never myself think it worth wading through so much dirt to get at. Where any of his best strokes are picked out for me, or separately quoted, I am always highly pleased, and can grin most cordially; but where I hear the bad with the good, it preponderates too heavily to suffer my mind to give the good fair play.”‡ “Pasquin,” like the rest, had to be relieved of its dross; and the work was done by a master hand. Undergoing a

\* “The London Chronicle,” Oct. 3-5, 1780.

† “An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope,” II, 1782, p. 126.

‡ Letter to Mrs. Phillips, Oct. 3, 1783, in “Diary and Letters of Madame D’Arblay,” 1904, II, 226.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

sea-change, "Pasquin" emerged as Sheridan's "Critic." All the politics of the old piece disappeared; all that had died with Sir Robert Walpole; the general situation of author and critic at odds, however, remained along with some close resemblances in the dialogue. Not to go into details of differences, "The Critic" is the production of a dramatist of the first order taking his cue from a wit of equal brilliance who found the restraints of the drama irksome, who broke through them and sometimes wrote a novel when he thought he was writing a comedy.

Several other good things passed from Fielding to Sheridan, from the great novels as well as from the plays. That any of them should have come from the novels is a little strange, for Sheridan once expressed a preference for Sidney's "Arcadia" over all the novels of Fielding and Smollett, saying: "For my own part, when I read for entertainment, I had much rather view the characters of life as I would wish they *were* than as they *are*: therefore I hate novels and love romance."<sup>\*</sup> But "Joseph Andrews" and "Tom Jones" abound in dramatic situations and dramatic characters, which caught the eye of Sheridan. "Did ever poet, dramatist, or novel-writer," Samuel Rogers asked, "devise a more effective incident than the falling of the rug in Molly Seagrim's bedroom? Can any thing be more happily ludicrous, when we consider how the actors in that scene are connected with each other? It probably suggested to Sheridan the falling of the screen in 'The School for Scandal.'"<sup>†</sup> Mrs. Malaprop in "The Rivals" clearly derives from Mrs. Slipslop either directly or through characters like Termagant in Murphy's "Upholsterer"; and at the first performance of "The School for Scandal," it

\* "Letter to Grenville," Oct. 30, 1772, in "Sheridan, a Biography," by W. Fraser Rae, New York, 1896, I, 234-235.

† "Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers," edited by Dyce, 1887, p. 230.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

was observed that Joseph and Charles Surface, though quite different in many respects, were the Blifil and Tom Jones of the new piece.\* All that now remains of Fielding's plays for the stage is what was taken over by Sheridan. Except in private, the best of them could no more be performed now than could "The Beggar's Opera." Gay and Fielding belong to a far distant past, when follies and vices of a corrupt society could be depicted directly without affronting the public sense of propriety. Both fought—Fielding the more strenuously—for the perfect freedom of the stage, and both lost. Since Fielding went down in the conflict there has never been any chance for debate on a question which was settled by law and custom. His plays, however, will surely be read more and more as time goes on, for they display his wit and humour in the full abandon of youth.

The real controversy was over the novels. As soon as Smollett had cooled his heels, he wrote handsomely, as I have already quoted him, of his imaginary rival. Dr. Hill, though he outrageously abused Fielding in the newspaper warfare, really had the highest admiration for "Tom Jones" and "Joseph Andrews." In his anonymous pamphlet of self-praise, entitled "A Parallel between the Characters of Lady Frail and the Lady of Quality in *Peregrine Pickle*" (1751), he awarded the honour of "inventing," so the phrase used to run, the modern novel to "Mr. Fielding, one of the greatest genius's in his way, that this, or perhaps any age or nation have produced." Even Horace Walpole could, in a backhanded way, give Fielding his due. But Richardson never became reconciled to Fielding's encroachment upon domains which belonged to himself alone by right of a prior invasion. After Richardson's death, Dr. Johnson took up the cudgel for his deceased friend. He always felt under great obligation to Richardson, who

\* "The London Chronicle," May 8-10, 1777.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

had, it is said, bailed him out of jail in the days of his poverty. This and other great services a man of so sound a heart could never forget. Accordingly, Johnson on every opportunity acted as Richardson's champion against the claims of an intruder.

What Johnson's unbiassed opinion of Fielding's novels was no one quite knows, for he rarely had an unbiassed opinion on any subject. I surmise that his first-hand knowledge of Fielding was very slight. He said himself that he had never read "*Joseph Andrews*"; nor is there any evidence that he ever read "*Tom Jones*." He several times told his friends that he read "*Amelia*" through "without stopping." If this be so, it is the only book that Johnson ever read through. The phrase in his mouth meant no more than that he once turned the leaves of the novel and then laid it aside for good. He saw enough, however, to declare that "*Amelia* was the most pleasing heroine of all the romances," Clarissa Harlowe not excepted. This was probably Johnson's real opinion. When Miss Burney published "*Evelina*," he was profuse in his praise of the novel, exclaiming that both Richardson and Fielding "would have been really afraid of her." And again:

" 'Oh, Mr. Smith, Mr. Smith is the man!' cried he, laughing violently. 'Harry Fielding never drew so good a character!—such a fine varnish of low politeness!—such a struggle to appear a gentleman!' "\*

This was merely a rhetorical flourish, for the Mr. Smith of "*Evelina*" in no way resembles any character in Fielding's novels. In the interest of Richardson, Johnson called Fielding "a blockhead" and "a barren rascal," meaning thereby that Fielding's novels had no substance, that they were superficial pictures of life, only "the shell" without "the kernel," when brought into comparison with Richardson's. There was as great a difference between the two

\* "Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay," 1904, I, 72.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

writers, he often asserted, “as between a man who knew how a watch was made, and a man who could tell the hour by looking on the dial-plate.” Fielding’s novels, as I have previously observed, were the watches which only the sharp-eyed were able to read, while Richardson’s were the dials by which one might see at a glance where the sun stood in the heavens. At other times he used to quote with approbation Richardson’s remarks that “had he not known who Fielding was, he should have believed he was an ostler” because of the low breeding of his characters, and that “the virtues of Fielding’s heroes were the vices of a truly good man.” These striking phrases of Richardson he kept in circulation and repeated them so often that he actually believed Fielding’s men were all libertines. His stubborn misapprehension explains Johnson’s terrible reprimand of Hannah More for reading “*Tom Jones*.” She wrote to her sister in 1780:

“I never saw Johnson really angry with me but once. . . . I alluded rather flippantly, I fear, to some witty passage in ‘*Tom Jones*’; he replied, ‘I am shocked to hear you quote from so vicious a book. I am sorry to hear you have read it; a confession which no modest lady should ever make. I scarcely know a more corrupt work.’ I thanked him for his correction; assured him I thought full as ill of it now as he did, and had only read it at an age when I was more subject to be caught by the wit, than able to discern the mischief. Of ‘*Joseph Andrews*,’ I declared my decided abhorrence. He went so far as to refuse to Fielding the great talents which are ascribed to him, and broke out into a noble panegyric on his competitor Richardson; who, he said, was as superior to him in talents as in virtue, and whom he pronounced to be the greatest genius that had shed its lustre on this path of literature.”\*

The “Great Cham” of literature was altogether too

\* W. Roberts, “*Memoirs of Hannah More*,” New York, 1835, I, 101.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

violent to exert the influence he intended in favour of Richardson. Hannah More, then a mature spinster of thirty-five, was evidently more frightened than convinced by his outburst. Of others who were intimately associated with him, several spoke well of Fielding's works. Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu, the Blue Stocking, in an imaginary conversation which she contributed to Lyttelton's "Dialogues of the Dead" in 1760, makes a Modern Bookseller describe to Plutarch those novels of Richardson and Fielding which have taken the place of ancient biographies.\* Plutarch, after hearing of Clarissa's "perfect purity of mind" and Sir Charles Grandison's "sentiments so exalted as to render him equal to every public duty," inquires of the Bookseller, who has just left the world, whether Richardson has any compeer. To the question the Bookseller replies:

"Yes, we have another writer of these imaginary Histories; One who has not long since descended to these regions; his Name is Fielding, and his works, as I have heard the best judges say, have a true spirit of Comedy, and an exact representation of Nature, with fine moral touches. He has not indeed given lessons of pure and consummate Virtue, but he has exposed Vice and Meanness with all the powers of ridicule."

From this estimate of Fielding, Mrs. Montagu was never swerved by Dr. Johnson. In his very presence she declared that Fielding was "admirable in novel-writing," and received no rebuke, perhaps because she added that "he never succeeded when he wrote for the stage"—a remark which Dr. Johnson approved.

Likewise, Fanny Burney, though in the main a Richardsonian, continued to read Fielding in spite of Johnson's tirades. In the preface to "Evelina," she dared mention him along with Marivaux, Richardson, Smollett, and Dr.

\* "Dialogues of the Dead," 1760, pp. 318-319.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

Johnson, as writers who had “saved the novel from contempt and rescued it from depravity.” It was very pleasing to her to be told that her own novel surpassed anything that Fielding ever wrote; and it was Mrs. Montagu’s remark that he failed in the drama which led her and Dr. Burney to discover for themselves whether the assertion was true. Sir Joshua Reynolds, a member of Johnson’s own club, regarded “*Tom Jones*” as “a work of the highest merit”;\* and Goldsmith, though he no more than accorded Fielding a place among the most reputable of modern novelists, took from him the title of his first comedy, and elsewhere did him the honour of imitation. Hazlitt rather overstated the case when he said that Dr. Primrose is but a variation on Parson Adams, and that the latter part of “*The Vicar of Wakefield*” is “an almost entire plagiarism from Wilson’s account of himself, and Adams’s domestic history.”† Still, without “*Joseph Andrews*” there never could have been “*The Vicar of Wakefield*.” Finally, “Johnson’s excessive and inaccountable depreciation of one of the best of writers that England has produced” amazed Boswell, his famous biographer, at a time when “*Tom Jones*” had “stood the test of public opinion with such success, as to have established its great merit, both for the story, the sentiments and the manners, and also the varieties of diction.” Boswell preferred “the neat watches of Fielding” to “the large clocks of Richardson,” and thought their dial-plates much brighter. “Fielding’s characters,” he observes, “though they do not expand themselves so widely in dissertation, are as just pictures of human nature, and I will venture to say, have more striking features, and nicer touches of the pencil.” And on the remark that Fielding’s virtues were really vices, he justly

\* Sir Joshua Reynolds’s “*Discourses*,” edited by Helen Zimmern, 1887, pp. 222-223.

† “*Standard Novels and Novelists*,” in “*Collected Works*,” 1904, X, 34.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

adds "that the moral tendency of Fielding's writings, though it does not encourage a strained and rarely possible virtue, is ever favourable to honour and honesty, and cherishes the benevolent and generous affections. He who is as good as Fielding would make him, is an amiable member of society."\*

Only one of Johnson's well-known friends completely agreed with him about Fielding. That person was Sir John Hawkins, who had been associated with Johnson in the early days on "The Gentleman's Magazine." Educated as an attorney, Hawkins became in the course of time a justice of the peace for Middlesex, and the King duly knighted him for his services. He was one of the original members of Johnson's club. Hawkins wrote cantatas which were sung at Vauxhall and Ranelagh; he wrote a history of music; he wrote Johnson's will and ended his career by writing a biography of the great man in rivalry with Boswell's. Though Johnson declared him "an honest man at the bottom," he was ill-mannered, ill-natured, and mean. Whether Hawkins had a grudge against Fielding is not known; but he left a character-sketch of him which recalls the vicious assaults of that old Argus of the Hundred Eyes whom we have formerly met in this book. Probably Johnson himself would have balked at the following description of Fielding and his work:

"At the head of these [writers of fiction] we must, for many reasons, place Henry Fielding, one of the most motley of literary characters. This man was, in his early life, a writer of comedies and farces, very few of which are now remembered; after that, a practising barrister with scarce any business; then an anti-ministerial writer, and quickly after, a creature of the duke of Newcastle, who gave him a nominal qualification of 100l. a year, and set him up as a trading-justice, in which disreputable station he died. He

\* "Boswell's Life of Johnson," edited by G. B. Hill, 1887, II, 49.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

was the author of a romance, intitled 'The history of Joseph Andrews,' and of another, 'The Foundling, or the history of Tom Jones,' a book seemingly intended to sap the foundation of that morality which it is the duty of parents and all public instructors to inculcate in the minds of young people, by teaching that virtue upon principle is imposture, that generous qualities alone constitute true worth, and that a young man may love and be loved, and at the same time associate with the loosest women. His morality, in respect that it resolves virtue into good affections, in contradiction to moral obligation and a sense of duty, is that of lord Shaftesbury vulgarised, and is a system of excellent use in palliating the vices most injurious to society. He was the inventor of that cant-phrase, goodness of heart, which is every day used as a substitute for probity, and means little more than the virtue of a horse or a dog; in short, he has done more towards corrupting the rising generation than any writer we know of."\*

This is the *ne plus ultra* of malicious criticism. Perhaps it goes too far to be amusing; whereas Johnson, whose prejudices were honest enough, is always amusing. Horace Walpole, on reading in Boswell that Johnson thought Gray "dull," and disliked Prior, Swift, and Fielding, remarked: "If an elephant could write a book, perhaps one that had read a great deal would say that an Arabian horse is a very clumsy, ungraceful animal. Pass to a better chapter!"†

There were also Smollettites, who degraded Fielding in order to raise Smollett; but they are not so entertaining as the Richardsonians because they were usually more fair-minded. Thus Dr. John Moore, who wrote the first biography of the Scot, was without marked prejudices. A compatriot of Smollett, he knew him well, having been his lifelong friend and medical adviser. In his youth he had

\* "The Works of Samuel Johnson," edited by Hawkins, 1787, I, 214-215.

† "Letters of Horace Walpole," edited by P. Toynbee, 1903, XIV, 439.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

attended the lectures of Fielding's surgeon, William Hunter, and had probably seen Fielding also. Moore was known as the author of "Zeluco" (1786), a very popular novel, written more in the line of Smollett than of Fielding. In 1797, he published an edition of Smollett's works accompanied by a biography and an essay on the commencement and progress of romance. While he exalted Smollett, he was impressed with "the great talents" displayed by "the late Henry Fielding" in "Joseph Andrews" and especially in the perfect workmanship of "Tom Jones." No Fieldingite could have found much fault with Moore's whole-hearted estimate. Certainly the author of "Tom Jones" received better treatment from Dr. Moore than he did from Dr. Robert Anderson, another Scottish physician, who brought out in 1800 a similar edition of Smollett's works with a short memoir. On the great question at issue his conclusion was that "after perusing the wire-drawn history of 'Clarissa,' and the diffuse narrative of 'Tom Jones,' we never quit them with so much reluctance as we feel in closing the pages of Smollett, who, with less regularity of fable, and without introducing so many observations of a moral tendency, or so much of what may be called fine writing, possesses, in an eminent degree, the art of rousing the feelings and fixing the attention of his readers."

The most ardent Smollettite in the South was William Godwin, the father of Mrs. Shelley. Godwin began his career as a nonconformist minister, but while still a young man he lost his faith under the influence of the French philosophers. His opinions, more radical than those of any other reputable writer of the time except Baron d'Holbach, were expressed in his "Political Justice" (1793), where he denounced all the institutions of society. Godwin was among the first of the English "perfectibilians"—a philosophical sect that looked forward to a perfect state of society, to a sort of millennium when there

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

should be no houses of parliament, no courts of justice, no church, no property rights, no marriage. In all his ways of thinking he was just the opposite of the orthodox Fielding, who championed the established order in church and state with the zeal of a Burke. All that survived from Godwin's nonconformist youth was a predilection for Scotsmen. He was thus perfectly equipped to fall foul of Fielding. This he did in "*The Enquirer*" (1797), a series of reflections on education, manners, and literature, of which a section in the twelfth essay in the second part of the treatise deals with the age of George the Second. Though Godwin admitted that "*Tom Jones*," judged merely as a piece of art, "is certainly one of the most admirable performances in the world," he had nothing but contempt for its style and thought. These are Godwin's words:

"The style however is glaringly inferior to the constituent parts of the work. It is feeble, costive and slow. It cannot boast of periods elegantly turned or delicately pointed. The book is interspersed with long discourses of religious or moral instruction; but these have no novelty of conception or impressive sagacity of remark, and are little superior to what any reader might hear at the next parish-church. The general turn of the work is intended to be sarcastic and ironical; but the irony is hard, pedantic and unnatural. . . . When Fielding delights us, he appears to go out of himself. The general character of his genius, will probably be found to be jejune and puerile."

By Fielding's "going out of himself," Godwin meant his power to project himself into a Tom Jones or a Parson Adams. Smollett he declared to be in most particulars the direct reverse of Fielding. The Scot was as profound as the Englishman was shallow. Again, these are the words on Smollett:

"He has published more volumes, upon more subjects, than perhaps any other author of modern date; and, in all,

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

he has left marks of his genius. The greater part of his novels are peculiarly excellent. He is nevertheless a hasty writer; when he affects us most, we are aware that he might have done more. In all his works of invention, we find the stamp of a mighty mind. In his lightest sketches, there is nothing frivolous, trifling and effeminate. In his most glowing portraits, we acknowledge a mind at ease, rather essaying its powers, than tasking them. We applaud his works; but it is with a profounder sentiment that we meditate his capacity."

These parallels, in the manner of Plutarch, between Smollett and Fielding, have never quite died out. One of the most skilful was drawn up in 1821 by Sir Walter Scott as an introduction to Smollett's novels for Ballantyne's Novelists' Library. As a Scotsman, the author of "Waverley" felt it a duty to prove, by well-balanced phrases, that Smollett should be granted an equal rank with Fielding. Here is an average passage in which Smollett gets the better of the antithesis:

"If Fielding had superior taste, the palm of more brilliancy of genius, more inexhaustible richness of invention, must in justice be awarded to Smollett. In comparison with his sphere, that in which Fielding walked was limited; and compared with the wealthy profusion of varied character and incident which Smollett has scattered through his works, there is a poverty of composition about his rival. Fielding's fame rests on a single *chef d'oeuvre*; and the art and industry which produced 'Tom Jones,' was unable to rise to equal excellence in 'Amelia.' Though, therefore, we may justly prefer 'Tom Jones' as the most masterly example of an artful and well-told novel to any individual work of Smollett; yet 'Roderick Random,' 'Peregrine Pickle,' and 'Humphry Clinker,' do each of them far excel 'Joseph Andrews' or 'Amelia'; and, to descend still lower, 'Jonathan Wild,' or 'The Journey to the

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

next World,' cannot be put into momentary comparison with 'Sir Lancelot Greaves,' or 'Ferdinand Count Fathom.' ”

Nothing more futile than this paragraph was ever written by the great romancer. The most patriotic Scot of the twentieth century would subscribe to none of the instances given of Smollett's superiority over Fielding. Smollett has been winnowed down to “Roderick Random” and “Humphry Clinker.” None of his other novels count any longer in popular esteem, though a number of scenes in “Peregrine Pickle” show his mind and art at the highest point of their attainment.

The most zealous advocate of Smollett or Richardson always conceded something in his case against Fielding. Dr. Johnson, though he gave the palm to Richardson, could find no heroine in his friend's novels so admirable as *Amelia*. Sir John Hawkins in his attack on Fielding denounced also the entire brood of modern novelists. If he placed the author of “Tom Jones” on a bad eminence, it was one out-topping all others. Likewise Godwin and Scott admired the wonderful constructive power displayed in this masterpiece. In short, “Tom Jones,” from the day of its publication, was generally, though not invariably, regarded as a most finished product of the human intellect. The questions in dispute mostly lay outside its form and structure; they concerned its characters, its humour, and especially the morality of certain scenes and of the novel as a whole. With “Tom Jones” were joined, in praise or condemnation, “Amelia” and “Joseph Andrews.” In Godwin's view Fielding was a buffoon; while Joseph Warton, who had passed in youth two evenings with him, paid a tribute to his learning, his “profound knowledge of man,” and his “rich vein of humour,” unequalled by any save the world's greatest humorists.\* In similar phrases, James Beattie, who took his cue from Lord Lyttelton, de-

\* “An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope,” II, 1782, pp. 126, 404.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

clared that Fielding “possessed more wit and humour, and more knowledge of mankind, than any other person of modern times.” Most of all he liked Squire Western, Dr. Harrison, and Parson Adams, “a character of masterly invention, and, next to Don Quixote, the most ludicrous personage that ever appeared in romance.”\* Lord Monboddo, the Scottish judge, who had also associated with Lyttelton, was inclined to take exception to Fielding’s digressions with mock-heroics; but had never read, he said, any other book, ancient or modern, so alive with comic characters as “Tom Jones.” It was “an extraordinary effort both of genius and art.”†

And there is Gibbon, whose references to Fielding were by no means confined to the eulogy involving a reputed kinship to the House of Hapsburg. Though he was born thirty years later than Fielding, he knew in his youth a London which had not essentially changed since the novelist’s death. He attended a course of lectures on anatomy given by “Doctor Hunter”—either John or William,—and thus may have had a more definite connection with Fielding through this physician. In his “Autobiography,” he imitated the passage where Fielding plays with the fancy that he may be read, in Gibbon’s paraphrase, by “the grandchildren of those who are yet unborn”; and in “The Decline and Fall,” he wrote of “Tom Jones” as “the romance of a great master, which may be considered as the history of human nature.” And again, in his last word on the novel he called it “the first of ancient or modern romances.” It was the massive completeness of “Tom Jones,” comparable to Gibbon’s own account of the decay of an empire, that appealed to the historian.‡

\* “*Dissertations, Moral and Critical*,” 1783, 571-573; and “*Essays*,” 1776, 428, 586, 599, 685, 691.

† “*Of the Origin and Progress of Language*,” 1776, III, 134-135, 298.

‡ See index to Gibbon’s “*Memoirs*,” edited by G. B. Hill, 1900; and the “*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*,” edited by J. B. Bury, 1897, III, 363.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

On Fielding's morality were expressed the most divergent opinions. Hawkins, as we have seen, discovered that his orthodoxy had been contaminated by the weak philosophy of Lord Shaftesbury; whereas Godwin the iconoclast could see in his moral disquisitions only the most commonplace homilies of a country parson. Bishop Warburton linked Fielding with Marivaux among the foremost writers "who have given a faithful and chaste copy of life and manners." Vicesimus Knox, the head-master of Tunbridge School, found Fielding's scenes of real life equally faithful and entertaining also; but he apprehended that some of them might corrupt "a mind unseasoned by experience."\* Throwing the emphasis the other way, Hugh Blair, the Presbyterian divine and rhetorician, felt that, though Fielding's humour might not always be of "the most refined and delicate kind," "the general scope of his stories is favourable to humanity and goodness of heart."†

As in these last two instances, there was usually some qualifying clause when critics approached the conduct of Fielding's characters. Their attitude reflected, in varying degrees, the general run of public opinion. Colman made over "the admirable novel of Tom Jones" into a comedy called "The Jealous Wife," which met with "prodigious success" at Drury Lane in the winter and spring of 1761. The cast included Garrick, Palmer, Mrs. Pritchard, and Mrs. Clive. Excepting the jealous couple, nearly all the rest was taken from the novel; but Blifil is no longer a hypocrite, and Tom has no intrigue with the Lady Bellaston of the play. Eight years later, Joseph Reed, a less-known dramatist, turned "Tom Jones" into a comic opera for the company at Covent Garden. Night after night, Shuter as Squire Western kept the audience in continuous roar. Reed, who was a Presbyterian rope-maker, refashioned

\* "Essays, Moral and Literary," 1782, I, 69.

† "Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres," 1783, II, 409.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the plot of “the celebrated novel . . . replete with wit, humour, and character,” in accordance with extreme nonconformist views. Squire Western’s most violent oath is “Zounds”; Parson Supple, in order to avoid offence to the clergy, is transformed into a country squire who marries Diana Western instead of Mrs. Waters; and Tom Jones, “stripped of his libertinism,” becomes the legitimate son of Squire Allworthy’s sister. By these alterations, “Tom Jones” was brought into conformity with “the refined taste of the present age.”\*

A similar tendency to so-called refinement may be observed in the later imitations of Fielding’s novels. Heaven forbid that I should describe or merely enumerate here the facetious histories, memoirs, and lives which followed immediately in the wake of “Tom Jones.” A few of them have an interest in that they bear Fielding’s own name on the title-page. Such were “The History of Sir Harry Herald and Sir Edward Haunch, by Henry Fielding, Esq.” (1755), and “The Life and Adventures of a Cat, by the late Mr. Fielding” (1760). These and innumerable other imitations are worthless, disgraceful alike to author and reader. But George Crabbe the poet should never have destroyed a novel which he wrote in the winter of 1801-1802 on the lines of Fielding. Crabbe was an admirer of Fielding, whose influence is apparent in the clergy of “The Parish Register”; and the poet-divine was known among his friends as a second Parson Adams. In later life he argued all one morning with the Scottish poet Campbell, trying in vain to win him over from Smollett to Fielding.† The manuscript of his novel called “The Widow Grey,” he burned along with two others. It had a Dr. Allison, a benevolent

\* See the author’s preface to “Tom Jones, a Comic Opera,” 1769; “Lloyd’s Evening Post,” Jan. 13-16, 1769; and “St. James’s Chronicle,” Jan. 14-17, 1769.

† René Huchon, “George Crabbe and his Times,” translated from the French by Frederick Clarke, 1907, pp. 206-207, 394.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

gentleman, supposed to reflect Fielding's Dr. Harrison. In lieu of this lost novel, we have one modelled on "Tom Jones" by Richard Cumberland the dramatist, entitled "Henry," which appeared in 1795. There are twelve books of it with introductory chapters on the history and the art of fiction, on Fielding and the author's divergences from his model. It was a work of "two full years." "The inimitable composition of 'The Foundling,'" Cumberland remarks, "is fading away in some of its tints, though the hand of the master, as the correct delineator of nature, will be traced to all posterity."\* Cumberland aimed to give the public a new Tom Jones, a virtuous young man who resists Potiphar's wife; the result was a Joseph Andrews taken seriously, as if Cumberland did not see the comedy of the original. But the most significant fact is that the character of Tom Jones was reworked so as to become harmless.

Cumberland's fear, thus indirectly expressed, of the influence of the real Tom Jones upon young readers kept coming to the front in other writers. Hawkins, as I have quoted him, declared that Fielding had corrupted an entire generation. The whole subject was canvassed by Clara Reeve, another novelist, in a sprightly dialogue called "The Progress of Romance."† Euphrasia and Sophronia are of the opinion that the "mixed characters" of Fielding, though virtue may predominate in them, do mischief to "young men of warm passions and not strict principles" in that such characters supply a shelter or excuse for conduct not wholly exemplary. Hortensius, perhaps resenting the personal insinuation, replies that in Fielding's works "virtue has always the superiority she ought to have, and challenges the honours that are justly due to her." With

\* Initial chapter to Book V. See also "Memoirs of Richard Cumberland, written by Himself," 2 vols., 1807.

† "The Progress of Romance," 1785, I, 139-141.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

this conclusion the ladies of classic names are persuaded to agree, though somewhat against their will, for they still prefer that characters should be so distinctly marked that a reader may know at a glance which to admire and which to condemn. Miss Reeve's quiet irony puts her among the Fieldingites. On the other hand, Thomas Green of Ipswich, who read Fielding's novels at the age of thirty, was disgusted, as he thought everybody else should be, with the vulgarity of an author who could not soar higher "than the lowest scenes of high life" and descended "*con amore* into the vilest and most blasted depths of low life";\* while Thomas James Mathias, a satirist who scored Lewis's "Monk" for its immoral scenes, recommended "Tom Jones, that great comick Epick poem,"† to all who would improve their minds and know life as it is. Jane Austen, like Miss Burney and Hannah More, read Fielding in her youth, but she never, so far as I remember, disclosed her personal opinion of his works. In "Northanger Abbey," the favourite novel of the girls is "The Mysteries of Udolpho," while Mrs. Moreland cares for none except "Sir Charles Grandison." Only Jack Thorpe has looked into "Tom Jones." Each of the company speaks in character; and so the clever Jane Austen escapes without telling us what we should like to know. In his earliest school-days, Wordsworth read "all Fielding's works" along with "Don Quixote," "Gil Blas," and parts of Swift, and in mature life recalled with pleasure the advantages of this perfect freedom.‡ It was much later when his sister Dorothy, towards thirty years old, took down the volumes of Fielding. Recording the fact in her diary under dates in November, 1800, she makes no comment on "Tom Jones" and

\* "Extracts from the Diary of a Lover of Literature," 1810, pp. 192, 198-199.

† "The Pursuits of Literature," seventh edition, 1798, p. 59.

‡ "Memoirs of William Wordsworth," by Christopher Wordsworth, Boston, 1851, I, 9-10.

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

“Amelia,” which she was then reading at Grasmere; but observes that “the Michaelmas daisy droops, the pansies are full of flowers.”\*

In contrast with the reticence of the demure Dorothy Wordsworth, two very precocious boys spoke out with delightful frankness. The one was George Canning, the future wit, orator, and statesman, who conducted with a group of friends at Eton a periodical called “The Microcosm,”—the most readable publication of the kind ever written by schoolboys. At the time Canning was but seventeen years old. In an essay under the date of May 14, 1787, he offered an ingenious though false explanation of how the novel derived from the romance, ending with a general condemnation of both species of fiction, with the exception of the works of Richardson and Fielding. Though “there cannot be,” he writes, “a more partial admirer” of “Tom Jones” than himself, he thinks that the novel is commonly put into the hands of children at too early an age. That Tom “is a character,” he explains, “drawn faithfully from nature, by the hand of a master, most accurately delineated, and most exquisitely finished, is, indeed, indisputable. But is it not also a character, in whose shades the lines of right and wrong, of propriety and misconduct, are so intimately blended, and softened into each other, as to render it too difficult for the indiscriminating eye of childhood to distinguish between rectitude and error?”† So on the whole it would be better, the boy concludes, for children to read “Sir Charles Grandison” before taking up “Tom Jones” at the ripe age, I suppose, of sixteen or seventeen.

The other precocious boy came somewhat later; he was Thomas Babington Macaulay. His father, Zachary Macaulay, who belonged to an Evangelical body within the

\* “Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth,” edited by William Knight, 1897, I, 57.

† Reprint of “The Microcosm,” 1835, p. 64.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Church of England, edited "The Christian Observer," the principal organ of his sect. These very strict people placed all novelists under the ban as "the most fruitful source both of individual and national vice." An especially rabid article to this effect which appeared under the signature of A. A. in "The Christian Observer" for August, 1815, awakened the indignation of young Macaulay, who, despite his father's protests, had read novels ever since he could read at all. Tom was then only in his fifteenth year, rather too young yet to cross swords with an antagonist of full growth. The next year, however, he felt safe in entering the lists with a direct and positive denial of everything that A. A. had hurled against his favourite books. His hot reply was published anonymously in his father's magazine for December, 1816. "The man," declares the boy, "who rises unaffected and unimproved from the picture of the fidelity, simplicity, and virtue of Joseph Andrews and his Fanny, and the parental solicitude of Parson Adams, must possess a head and a heart of stone." On the larger question at issue, the lad of sixteen remarks: "Perhaps it may serve to console A. A., under his alarm for poor England, that no age has been more fertile in deep philosophical and scientific research, that in none has religion been more reverenced at home or more widely diffused abroad—that in none have our fair countrywomen . . . been more actively benevolent than in the present. Severe indeed is the cynic who would preclude the English ladies from any lighter studies than Butler's *Analogy* and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*." This brilliant defence of Fielding and the novel in general brought down upon the editor of "The Christian Observer," says Macaulay's biographer, "the most violent objurgations from scandalized contributors, one of whom informed the public that he had committed the obnoxious number to the flames, and should thenceforward

## OLD CONTROVERSIES

cease to take in the magazine.”\* Before the tempest could be stilled, Zachary Macaulay had to explain that the article, as abhorrent to himself as to his readers, was sent in by an anonymous contributor and inadvertently printed. Tom confessed to the subterfuge, but could not be brought to alter his opinion of Fielding, praise of whom had more than all else raised the storm which threatened to overwhelm his father’s periodical.

The question debated by these famous youngsters, by Clara Reeve, and by many others can never be settled to the satisfaction of everybody. Not long ago “*Tom Jones*” was expurgated by a member of the Fielding family; and more recently the trustees of a public library in England incinerated their sole copy of the original novel. A very moral professor of English literature in the University of Pennsylvania once wrote for boys and girls an account of our literature from Chaucer to Tennyson,† without even mentioning Fielding’s name; and long before him William H. Brown of Boston published a novel called “*Ira and Isabella*,” in the preface to which he drew up a comparative estimate of the greatest novelists; but in the list which includes Defoe, Richardson, Smollett, and Sterne, there is no Fielding, evidently because the author believed his novels were not exactly suited “to allure the untutored mind to the practice of virtue . . . and to deter it from vice.”‡ Similarly, Howells in his “*Heroines of Fiction*” had no word for either *Amelia* or *Sophia*. So far as he was concerned, they were non-existent. On the other hand, Thackeray read “*Joseph Andrews*” in boyhood; and John Oliver Hobbes (Mrs. Craigie, the novelist) thought that “the epics of ‘*Tom Jones*’ and ‘*Amelia*’ ought to be given

\* G. O. Trevelyan, “*Life and Letters of Macaulay*,” 1875, I, 68.

† “*Introduction to English Literature from Chaucer to Tennyson*,” by Henry Reed, London, 1857.

‡ “*Ira and Isabella; or the Natural Children*,” Boston, 1807. See “*The Nation*” of New York for Dec. 23, 1915.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

to every girl on her eighteenth birthday," on the ground that they would save her from innumerable mistakes and fears.\* Not presuming to advise young ladies, Coleridge gave Fielding a clean bill so far as his own sex was concerned. These are his famous words:

"I do loathe the cant which can recommend Pamela and Clarissa Harlowe as strictly moral, though they poison the imagination of the young with continued doses of *tinct. lyttæ*, while Tom Jones is prohibited as loose. I do not speak of young women;—but a young man whose heart or feelings can be injured, or even his passions excited, by aught in this novel, is already thoroughly corrupt. There is a cheerful, sunshiny, breezy spirit that prevails everywhere, strongly contrasted with the close, hot, day-dreamy continuity of Richardson. Every indiscretion, every immoral act, of Tom Jones (and it must be remembered that he is in every one taken by surprise—his inward principles remaining firm—) is so instantly punished by embarrassment and unanticipated evil consequences of his folly, that the reader's mind is not left for a moment to dwell or run riot on the criminal indulgence itself. In short, let the requisite allowance be made for the increased refinement of our manners,—and then I dare believe that no young man who consulted his heart and conscience only, without adverting to what the world would say—could rise from the perusal of Fielding's Tom Jones, Joseph Andrews, or Amelia, without feeling himself a better man;—at least, without an intense conviction that he could not be guilty of a base act."†

\* "Letters from a Silent Study," London, 1904, p. 229.

† "Complete Works of S. T. Coleridge," New York, 1884, IV, 380.

## CHAPTER XXXIII

### THE FAME OF FIELDING

#### FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

By this time Fielding had grown into fame across the Channel. There is “a vulgar error” that he never counted for much on the Continent, and especially in France, because the manners which he depicted were so peculiarly English that no foreigner could make anything out of his characters. Nobody but an Englishman, it has been said many times over, could understand him; nobody could possibly translate him. In some degree, all these statements are true. A great writer is never completely translatable; his works never have half the direct effect usually claimed for them upon foreign literatures. If he becomes more than a name, he is most fortunate. If he has imitators they follow him at a distance, taking and reworking to their own purposes incidents and scenes which they imperfectly comprehend. He is little more than a source of inspiration for something new. In course of time his influence fades until it becomes hardly traceable except in those minor writers whom no one ever reads. It was so with Richardson in spite of the enthusiasm which greeted “Pamela” and “Clarissa.” It was so with Sterne despite his triumphant passage through Parisian salons and the thousand flatteries from philosophers and men of letters. Holding these views, I can make no extravagant claims for Fielding’s permanent influence on French or German literature. I rather seek to give him his proper place in the *furor Anglicanus* during the period immediately succeeding his death,

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

when the intellectuals in Western and Central Europe, affecting to ignore their own literatures, went mad over England's new writers as well as over Shakespeare and Milton.

The part played by Fielding in this passing phase of literary history has been subordinated, by even so competent a critic as M. Joseph Texte,\* to the rôles of Richardson and Sterne. True, Tom Jones was never received abroad with the raptures with which people embraced Clariissa and Grandison; nor was Fielding's appearance so bizarre as Sterne's. He was never feted in Paris, nor did pious pilgrims, so far as we know, cross the Channel to visit him and the scenes of his novels. Still, these novels were all translated, worked over, and imitated. They were probably as widely read, though by different people, as were the novels of Richardson and Sterne. Nor were they anywhere better known than in France, where, it has been too readily assumed, Fielding's realism gave offence.

By 1872 there had appeared, according to an approximate estimate made by Mr. Frederick S. Dickson, seventy-one foreign (mostly Continental) editions of "Tom Jones" to fifty-eight published in Great Britain; twenty-nine foreign editions of "Joseph Andrews" to thirty-nine at home; and twenty-one foreign editions of "Amelia" to but twelve in Great Britain. The translations include French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Polish, and Russian. For readers who wished merely the story, "Tom Jones" was condensed into a single French or German volume. In behalf of neither Richardson nor Sterne can there be presented such an array of translations. Surely Europe put its stamp on Fielding. Moreover, the intermediary for the earlier translations into other European languages was nearly always France, the very country where we have been told Fielding's novels were never welcome guests. France

\* "Jean-Jacques Rousseau," translated by J. W. Matthews, 1899.

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

led the way in 1743 with Desfontaines's rendering of "Joseph Andrews," revised the next year and many times reprinted. A copy, dated "Amsterdam, 1775," was found among the books of Marie Antoinette; it now reposes in the library of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. The Queen also had "Amélie" and two sets of "Tom Jones."\* The first German translations of "Joseph Andrews," one at Danzig and another at Berlin, bear the dates of 1745 and 1746; they were made from the French. In 1749 the novel went into Danish at Copenhagen, probably from the French also.

"Tom Jones" was translated into Dutch in 1749, and the next year into French and German. La Place's French version, first issued in London and Amsterdam, was published also at Paris, Rheims, Geneva, and Dresden; there were twenty or more reprints of it; and in 1757 it was turned into Italian. A German translation of "Amelia," published at Hanover in 1752, reached a third edition in 1763; and the next year a new one was brought out at Leipzig. A Dutch version by P. A. Verwer, dated 1758, has an interesting foreword and address to the reader on Fielding the novelist and delineator of men and women as they are. This was succeeded in 1762 and 1763 by two French translations—the first by Madame Riccoboni and the second by De Puisieux.

The first German and French translations of "Jonathan Wild" are dated 1750 and 1763; and of "A Journey from this World to the Next," 1759 and 1784 respectively. Perhaps there was no immediate translation of "A Voyage to Lisbon" into French, but there was one into German in 1764; and while Fielding's plays were losing their popularity in England, eight or more of them were adapted to the German stage. During this period Fielding's English works might be purchased at any of the large towns in

\* P. Lacroix, "Bibliothèque de la reine Marie-Antoinette au Petit Trianon," Paris, 1863.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

France or Germany. A curiosity was an English “Tom Jones” with a German foreword, forming a part of an “English Library” published at Gotha. Before the eighteenth century was over there were beautiful sets of Fielding’s works in small French volumes, labelled “Ouvres Complettes,” and comprising—besides the novels and “A Journey from this World to the Next”—“David Simple” and “Roderick Random.” The very year of his death, “The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless,” which Fielding despised, was translated, as I have remarked, into German as a new production by “the author of Tom Jones.” He was also credited with the “Mémoires du Chevalier de Kilpar” (1768) by Montagnac, which circulated widely in both French and German. The ascription to Fielding of these and other novels which he did not write is certain evidence that his reputation had commercial as well as literary value. “In France,” says Texte, “though the full significance of Fielding’s work was not perceived, his name was in every mouth.”

The Gallic Fielding was quite unlike the real one. The so-called translations were paraphrases in which Fielding appeared as a facetious story-teller and jester. Shorn of his digressions, his depth and dignity vanished; as soon as his dialogue was abridged and altered, his irony and humour lost their better part. There was really no reason why he should not have been the author of “Roderick Random” as well as of “Joseph Andrews,” for both, when made over, were picaresque novels in line with “Gil Blas”; merely farcical adventures in low life. To the first reviewer\* of Desfontaines’s translation, “Joseph Andrews” seemed to be filled with “petitesesses.” If the novel be a portrait of English manners, he said, it does little honour to England. The character of Parson Adams he somehow missed altogether; that gentleman as Fielding conceived

\* “Bibliothèque Françoise” for 1744 (tome XXXIX, 201-215).

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

him did not reappear; his gravity, his learning, his lofty ideals, were all made to minister to the tricks played upon him; he was made to look like a shabby country parson created by a fantastic imagination, not like a real man drawn from real life. The translator's defacement of "Joseph Andrews" accounts in part, no doubt, for the comparatively small interest which the French took in the novel.

La Place was no less unfaithful to the text of "Tom Jones"; but the comedy of this novel, the picaresque element being slight, could not be reduced to farce. The translator could not delete from the book, however much he might try, Tom Jones and Squire Western, if he retained anything. As I have pointed out earlier, the character which most perplexed the French was not Lady Bellaston; it was Sophia Western, whose disobedience and elopement in search of her lover made her a dangerous model for French girls; the indiscreet conduct of this charming heroine and nothing besides delayed for some days the publication of the novel in Paris. More than all else, the French were struck by the dramatic quality of "Tom Jones." The novel contained, said one reader, fifty scenes suitable for the stage; it must be dramatized. Accordingly, Antoine Ponsinet turned the novel into a comic opera of three Acts, called "Tom Jones, Comédie Lyrique," for which A. D. Philidor wrote the music. Following an overture, Sophia is seen sitting in the hall of her father's "château" by the side of the King; she is at work upon a piece of tapestry, while Honour on the other side of the hall is engaged upon a piece of lace. The scene shifts, and Squire Western enters with his huntsmen and sings to a lively air a song descriptive of the chase, beginning—

D'un Cerf, dix Cors, j'ai connaissance:  
On l'attaque au fort, on le lance;  
Tous sont prêts:  
Piqueurs et Valets

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Suivent les pas de l'ami Jones.

J'entends crier: Volc'lets, Volc'lets.

and ending—

L'animal forcé succombe,  
Fait un effort, se releve, enfin tombe.  
Et nos chasseurs chantent tous à l'envi:  
“Amis, goûtons les fruits de la victoire;  
Amis, Amis, célébrons notre gloire.

Halali, Fanfare, Halali  
Halali.”

The plot is of no significance; it serves merely as an excuse for the songs and music. The scenes, though designated as the chateau of M. Western and the inn at Upton, are really the park and forest of Fontainebleau; all the characters, except for their names, are thoroughly French; and the stain of Tom's illegitimacy is removed.

The opera was first produced at the Comédie Italienne in Paris on February 27, 1765, with Joseph Caillot, the noted bass, taking the part of Squire Western. “Never did a dramatic work,” said the reviewer, “have a more singular fortune. On the first night it completely failed; on the second night it met with complete success.”\* The piece, however, was condemned by the critic on the ground that it was far removed from the spirit and intent of Fielding. Particularly he could not bear to see a character so important as Blifil merely introduced at the end to untie the knot. The next season Poinsinet revised his opera, and it became long popular on the Continental stage. Within four years after its first performance, at least five editions appeared in Paris alone; it was reprinted for the local French theatres, at Avignon, Amsterdam, Dresden, Mannheim, Frankfort, and Copenhagen; and it suggested to Joseph Reed his English opera, for which he paraphrased several of the French songs.

\* “Journal Encyclopédique,” April 15, 1765. In an earlier form, the opera may have been performed at Versailles, the preceding year.

lui parler seul.

*M<sup>r</sup> Western.*

Il faut considérer....

*M<sup>r</sup> Western.*

C'est assez, c'est assez ma sœur.

(Elle sort.)

## SCENE V.

*M<sup>r</sup> Western Seul*

### ARIETTE

I

Violino 1<sup>o</sup>

Violino 2<sup>o</sup>

*M<sup>r</sup> Western.*

*Alto col.*

*Basso*

*Ah! quel plaisir je me promets! Je lui veux annoncer moi-même*

*poco f.*

*Quien ce jour, à celui qu'elle aime, je la vais unir pour jamais, je la vais unir pour ja*

*poco f.*



## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

The company at the Comédie Italienne also brought out, on October 22, 1782, "Tom Jones à Londres," a verse comedy in five Acts by Pierre Desforges. For his variations from the original plot, the author in a preface to the play, refers the curious reader to M. Fielding's novel, now "in everybody's hands," or to M. de la Place's "imitation of it." As in the comic opera, the hero again proves to be legitimate. The audience, it appears, objected to some Latin phrases put into the mouth of Partridge and to the racy speech of Squire Western and his sister in their quarrels. These criticisms were met good-naturedly by Desforges, and then his comedy succeeded to his entire satisfaction. In the library of Yale University is an undated manuscript copy of "Tom Jones Comédie," dealing with Tom, Sophia, and Lady Bellaston—the romance and the intrigue. It is a five-act play in prose. Though it only partially follows Desforges, it seems to have been prepared from his comedy for an amateur performance by someone who was puzzled by the English names, for the beautiful manuscript abounds in misspellings. Subsequently, Desforges wrote a continuation of his own comedy under the title of "Tom Jones et Fellamar," which was produced at the Comédie Italienne on April 17, 1787. His second piece—likewise five Acts in verse—takes up Fielding's characters where they were left at the end of the novel. Lord Fellamar, transformed from a libertine into a young man of exemplary conduct, gets a place for Tom Jones in the navy, where he soon reaches the rank of commodore. By his wonderful skill and bravery, Commodore Jones wins a great victory over Britain's enemies in the West Indies, and returns home to become an admiral. All the newspapers are filled with his fame. Some years later, he gives his daughter Sophia in marriage to Lord Fellamar and the curtain falls upon a scene of perfect happiness.

There are indications that the French themselves were

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

not quite pleased with the freedom displayed by their writers in the treatment of Fielding. In the Geneva edition of Fielding's works (1781-1782), Madame Riccoboni was taken to task for her alterations and suppressions in "Amelia," especially for making Booth rich and Dr. Garrison a sort of Quaker. Likewise Citizen Davaux, in bringing out a new translation of "Tom Jones," in "the year IV," or 1796, declared that the "Tom Jones" so well known in La Place's version, in comedy, and in comic opera, bore but little resemblance to the book which Fielding wrote. No one dependent upon these mutilations would ever surmise, he said, that Fielding was a philosopher, psychologist, and moralist who had studied closely the heart and human nature; that he possessed the *vis comica* of the ancients; that he was genial and gay and a man of the keenest intelligence. So Davaux undertook to give his countrymen the real Fielding by restoring all the initial chapters and other digressions suppressed by La Place as immaterial adjuncts to "Tom Jones." The new translator, however, did not always live up to his pretension. He wrote, I fear, with La Place's despised volumes open before him; and when he had to rely upon himself, he was often unable to read his author. Almost always he missed the local colour and the allusions. In the first chapter, he was staggered by "eleemosynary," and he passed by "Mr. Pope," "Bayonne ham or Bologna sausage" and "Heliogabalus." Here and elsewhere all piquant phrases were washed out. It is nevertheless true that in this translation and in its successors, of which there were at least seven during the next half-century, France obtained a truer conception of Fielding and his masterpiece.

The new conception appeared in "Le Portrait de Fielding," a one-act comedy in prose interspersed with songs, which was first performed at a vaudeville theatre in Paris on April 23, 1800. The authors, who subscribed themselves

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

as Citizens Ségur, Desfaucherets, and Després, wove their plot about the popular story of the way in which Fielding's portrait was obtained. The scene is laid in Hogarth's house, where Madame Miller has been installed as house-keeper and where Sophia, a beautiful girl of mysterious parentage, is staying as the painter's favourite pupil. For three long years Hogarth has many times mused over the features of his "immortal friend" without being able to reproduce them on canvas. During the evening, Garrick, aware of the painter's perplexity, walks in dressed as Fielding; and though Hogarth is rather frightened by the visitant whom he takes for Fielding's ghost, he preserves sufficient composure to draw the portrait of the revenant. Thereupon Garrick throws off his disguise with a laugh. A comparison between the portrait and a medallion of her father which Sophia wears about her neck reveals the same face. Sophia is Harry Fielding's daughter by his wife Amelia. The play closes with the marriage of Hogarth and Sophia. Though no plot could be more preposterous, the fine qualities of Fielding's character are everywhere insisted upon. He is a moralist of the first rank, a perfect friend of perfect disposition over whose loss Hogarth and Garrick deeply grieve:

Peintre de l'homme et censeur de nos vices,  
Toi, qui laissas, en charmant tous les coeurs,  
A tes lecteurs, d'éternelles délices,  
A tes amis, d'éternelles douleurs.

Another one-act comedy, composed throughout in verse and simply called "Fielding," exalted the novelist's generosity. This slight piece was written by Edouard Mennechet for the Théâtre Français, where it was produced on January 8, 1823. It elaborated the exploded Tonson anecdote. Fielding and a painter named Wilson occupy apartments in the house of M. Scott, a rich Londoner. The landlord, who is a widower, has a sister Mistress Scott and a daughter

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Sophia. For two years Fielding has been engaged upon "Tom Jones" while associating with the family and falling in love with the girl. He puts Sophia into the novel and also her father and aunt, who become Squire Western and his sister. Wilson began his career by painting idealized portraits of people of fashion and flourished exceedingly; but when, altering his views of art, he strove to paint them as they really are, he lost all his customers and was reduced to penury. He cannot pay his debts and Scott threatens to send him to jail. At the same time Fielding, by a proposal of marriage to Sophia, awakens the indignation of the landlord; and Mistress Scott becomes furious when she hears that she is represented in the forthcoming novel as a termagant. So it is decided that Fielding must also go to jail that morning unless he pays his arrears of rent before night. In great distress he applies to Tomson [sic] the bookseller, who gives him a paltry hundred pounds for the manuscript of "Tom Jones." But when Fielding sees Wilson setting out for jail, he turns the hundred pounds over to his friend who, having a wife and children, seems to need it more than himself, a wretched bachelor. The moral of the play should be that realism in art and letters does not pay; but the heart of the dramatist softens in the end. Not only does Wilson escape a debtor's prison, but Fielding, as soon as his magnanimity is disclosed, wins the admiration of aunt and father and the hand of the fair damsel. So Mennechet shifts the moral to

C'est en nous amusant qu'on peut nous corriger.

These literary crudities show a genuine and widespread interest in Fielding across the Channel. When a writer's novels are adjusted to the manners and customs of another race, when his masterpiece is converted into comedy and comic opera, when anecdotes about him are dramatized for vaudeville as well as for the regular stage, it may fairly be said that he is undergoing the process of absorption

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

among semi-literary people. Such was clearly the case with Fielding in France. More than this, the names of his characters were sometimes spelled in accordance with their pronunciation in French. Thus we have "Tom Jone" and "M. Alworti." Critical opinion of his work, however, was quite as much divided in France as in England. Rousseau, who was a Richardsonian, nowhere mentions, I think, Fielding. Probably the sentimentalist never read him. Voltaire, who looked into "Tom Jones," saw nothing even passable there except Partridge; and the novel was dismissed by Fréron as "low comedy." On the other hand, Madame du Deffand was impressed by its truth to fact and life. Whether a novelist should depict manners as they are or as duly refined for people of taste was pleasantly debated by this lady and Horace Walpole. "Tom Jones" Madame du Deffand liked the best of all novels, whereas her correspondent derived slight pleasure from its burlesque and coarseness. Barthe, the poet and novelist, wrote of Fielding: "No man in the world (without excepting Molière) was better acquainted with the shades which diversify characters." To La Harpe "Tom Jones" was "the first novel in the world." He also placed "Joseph Andrews" above "Clarissa Harlowe." Stendhal, while regretting in 1837 that "Tom Jones" was not so much read in France as formerly, said that "this novel is to other novels what the Iliad is among the epics." And "a certain French novelist," on reading the masterpiece, is reported to have remarked in more personal appreciation: "Ce livre m'attendait."\*

The last potent voice on Fielding in France was Taine,

\* "Lettres de la Marquise du Deffand à Horace Walpole," edited by Toynbee, 1912, III, 519, 525. "The Gentleman's Magazine" for Oct., 1770 (Vol. XL, 455), has a quotation from Barthe's novel "La Jolie Femme ou la Femme du Jour" (Lyon, 1769). La Harpe, "Lycée ou Cours de Littérature," Paris, 1816, VII, 271-274. "Mémoires d'un Touriste par De Stendhal," Paris, 1877, I, 39. Arnold Bennett, "Books and Persons," 1917, pp. 328-329.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the brilliant historian of English literature who, it has been charged, escaped dulness by not reading the books which he criticised. This was likewise the excellent formula of Dr. Johnson. But the complaint against Taine will not hold at all points. He had some acquaintance with "Tom Jones," "Joseph Andrews," "Amelia," and "Jonathan Wild," and he knew the anecdotes in Murphy's essay upon Fielding. The trouble with Taine was rather that he must adjust such knowledge as he possessed of an author to a definite theory of literary development; that he was a man of science, whose perceptive powers had been trained at the expense of the imagination and the primitive emotions. Thus, to cite an obvious example, he depicted Sir Walter Scott as a realist, calling him "The Homer of modern citizen life"; and then proceeded to derive from him Jane Austen, Dickens, and Thackeray, notwithstanding the fact that "Pride and Prejudice" antedates "Waverley" and that Dickens and Thackeray, except in their historical novels, passed by Scott for Smollett and Fielding. Taine felt none of the romance in Scott; it was all a sealed book to him. Still, his view of the romancer has its value. Scott, when dealing with peasant life, was a realist of the older type. At a time when this aspect of his art was being forgotten, it was well to have it set forth eloquently, even though the ensemble was essentially false. Taine's method with Fielding was similar, but less sympathetic. Possessed with the idea, in the main true, that Fielding protested on behalf of nature against the formal morality of Richardson, he developed his thesis to the conclusion that Fielding and all his characters were animals actuated only by physical passions. Addressing the author directly, Taine thus reprimands him:

"We tire at last of your fisticuffs and tavern bills. You flounder too readily in cowhouses, among the ecclesiastical pigs of Parson Trulliber. We would fain see you have

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

more regard for the modesty of your heroines; wayside accidents raise their tuckers too often; and Fanny, Sophia, Mrs. Heartfree, may continue pure, yet we cannot help remembering the assaults which have lifted their petticoats. You are so rude yourself, that you are insensible to what is atrocious. You persuade Tom Jones falsely, yet for an instant, that Mrs. Waters, whom he has made his mistress, is his mother, and you leave the reader long buried in the shame of this supposition. And then you are obliged to become unnatural in order to depict love; you can give but constrained letters; the transports of your Tom Jones are only the author's phrases. For want of ideas he declaims odes. You are only aware of the impetuosity of the senses, the upwelling of the blood, the effusion of tenderness, but not of the nervous exaltation and poetic rapture. Man, such as you conceive him, is a good buffalo; and perhaps he is the hero required by a people which is itself called John Bull.”\*

Fielding, his characters, and the people who read him, Taine means to say, are all “thick-skinned,” a phrase which he uses elsewhere specifically of Fielding. The truth is, Fielding was thin-skinned, most sensitive to praise and censure, quick to respond to all the finer emotions with which man in his fulness has been endowed. But just as Taine could discover no romance in Scott, because he had none in himself, so the man of science who maintained that “varieties of men” are analogous to “varieties of bulls and horses,” could see in Fielding only unadulterated animalism. He reduced Fielding to the requirements of a brutal theory of man, not much different from the materialism which the author of “Tom Jones” many times attacked and ridiculed. To be completely misrepresented is one of the penalties of fame.

\* Taine's “History of English Literature,” translated by H. Van Laun, 1871, II, 176.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Fielding merely grazed the surface of French literature; he never penetrated it. French writers praised his wit and humour, his insight into character, his genial philosophy of life; but they did not praise his art; that was repugnant to them. Though France has had ever since the seventeenth century long novels, they have never been quite rated as literature. Even the romances of Dumas, so widely popular abroad, are almost negligible in a Frenchman's view. They are tales written to entertain the masses; they have no part in the glories of French literature. In France the ideal novel approaches the conciseness of the drama. There must be in both genres a situation clearly presented in the form of a problem and afterwards worked out to a logical conclusion. The cultivated French mind, absorbed in the solution of the problem, becomes impatient of anything which impedes the course of pure logic. Author and reader alike regard extraneity as a certain sign of bad art. Hence La Place's excision of Fielding's digressions, which later translators restored only in part. It would never occur to a Frenchman to cast a novel in the Fielding mould.

In Germany no such rigidity has ever long prevailed. The German mind moves in a very free artistic medium—much less restricted, in fact, than the English. Men of letters across the Rhine wished to know Fielding as he was. Those who had a reading knowledge of English soon detected the fraud lurking in the translation of "Joseph Andrews" from the French, and they demanded that this and Fielding's other novels be rendered directly from the English. At Lessing's request, J. J. Bode, the translator of Sterne, made an excellent translation of "Tom Jones" in six volumes (1786-1788), in which all that Fielding had written was retained with reasonable completeness. The German imitators of Fielding, who followed in the wake of the early translators, adopted everything that was rejected in France. He was their model for novels divided

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

into books with introductory chapters on the novelist's art and purpose. They interspersed their narratives, as they went along, with addresses to the reader, with tales within tales, and with moral, literary and theological disquisitions of great length having little or no connection with the story. Over the chapters they placed facetious headings. They transplanted Tom Jones, Sophia, and Lady Bellaston, Squire Western and his sister, Mrs. Slipslop and Parson Adams. There was a whole flock of Partridges misquoting Latin. And just as Fielding stopped to pay compliments to Handel, Hogarth, Garrick, and many other friends, so these imitators brought in the names of their contemporaries, such as Mendelssohn, Gellert, and Goethe. At every point the English author was outdone. The novel was so stretched that it ceased to be, in the French sense, a novel at all. While the French completely repudiated Fielding's theory of fiction, the Germans accepted it without question. Blankenburg's "Versuch über den Roman," published in Leipzig in 1774, was frankly drawn from chapters on the novelist's art in "Joseph Andrews" and "Tom Jones." To several young writers just trying their pens Fielding seemed to point the way to a national novel that should worthily depict the manners of Germany.

Fielding's influence on German fiction of the day, it ought to be explained, was a current which ran counter to Richardson. At a time when Fielding was a mere name on the Continent, Germany had taken Richardson to her heart. Klopstock, author of "The Messiah," in which angels weep, applied for the post of chargé d'affaires in London in order to be near Richardson; and his wife, on reading "Sir Charles Grandison," wrote to Richardson: "Having finished your Clarissa, (oh! the heavenly book!) I would have pray'd you to write the history of a *manly* Clarissa, but I had not courage enough at that time. . . . You have since written the

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

manly Clarissa, without my prayer; oh you have done it, to the great joy and thanks of all your happy readers! Now you can write no more, you must write the history of an Angel.” Richardson placed in the hands of weak aspirants for literary fame a precise and easy formula for the construction of a novel. The plot—a seduction or an abduction—ran on the simplest lines. The characters, with a little shading here and there into real life, were all villains or patterns of moral excellence. Consequently the number of Richardson’s followers in Germany became endless. Writers of this class could not, were they so inclined, compose a novel, like any one of Fielding’s, based upon their own observation of men and manners, for they knew little or nothing of life. The mere imitations of Fielding in Germany are beneath contempt; they are only tales of facetious adventure given the outward form of “Tom Jones” or “Joseph Andrews.” The place where Fielding counted most was among writers of a better class who, though imitators in varying degrees, were competent to adjust Fielding’s characters to the conditions of German life. These men, in the main, led a reaction against the futile Richardsonian novels which were inundating German fiction. In their view, Fielding was the man at whose feet the novelist should take his permanent seat.\*

The first to assume a decided stand against Richardson was Musäus, who published in 1760-1762 his “Grandison der Zweite,” in ridicule of “the cursed Grandison fever” such as had attacked the Klopstocks. It was an amusing parody of its namesake, though the author, then a very young man, had not really divined the secret of “Joseph Andrews”; he rather followed the more direct and obvious

\* Augustus Wood, “Einfluss Fieldings auf die Deutsche Literatur,” a doctor’s dissertation, Yokohama, 1895. For Fielding’s influence on the German stage, this book should be supplemented by Carl Waldschmidt, “Die Dramatisierungen von Fielding’s Tom Jones,” Wetzlar, 1906.

## FIELDING IN FRANCE AND GERMANY

method of the "Anti-Pamela," an English burlesque which had been translated into German. Twenty years later Musäus reworked the whim of his youth into "Der Deutsche Grandison" (1781-1782), in which Richardson's characters appear along with shadowy reflections of the immortals in "Tom Jones." In the novel there is an enthusiast, who regards "Sir Charles Grandison" as true history; he makes a tour of the scenes in that famous novel and sends home letters describing them. Of less interest are two so-called novels by Hermes, entitled "Miss Fanny Wilkes" and "Sophiens Reise," which likewise swarm with Richardson's and Fielding's men and women in company. They are the crude productions of a writer uncertain of his master.

We come to something much better in Wieland, the translator of Shakespeare, who began his literary career in the camp of the Richardsonians. He once thought of writing a series of letters from Sir Charles Grandison on the subject of education, and he actually produced a play, called "Clementina von Porretta." But while at work upon his first novel, "Don Sylvio," he read Fielding and at once cast aside Richardson, whose characters were too virtuous for him. The presence of Fielding, visible in this novel, became most apparent in "Agathon" (1766-1773), which his friends hailed as "the German Tom Jones." It was also highly commended by Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Schiller. Wieland had none of the talent of the born story-teller; and "Agathon" is hardly a novel; still it does contain, perhaps for the first time in German fiction, characters delineated with some skill, united with a refreshing outlook upon life. What is best in it was inspired by Fielding.

More and more German criticism, after Blankenburg's "Versuch über den Roman," came over to the side of Fielding. Indeed there was never any decided hostility

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

towards him in Germany. Even Klopstock felt the charm of Fanny and Sophia; and Lessing, though deeply influenced by Richardson, admired and quoted Fielding. Lichtenberg, whose zeal for Fielding knew no bounds, declared that he was “the greatest novelist in the world”; and not long before his death designed a novel on the pattern of “Tom Jones.” Though the work was never completed, Lichtenberg was known, because of his trenchant wit and vast knowledge of men displayed in his miscellaneous writings, as “The German Fielding.” To Schiller Fielding was one of the world’s geniuses with a place by the side of Shakespeare and Cervantes. “Welch ein herrliches Ideal,” he exclaims, “musste nicht in der Seele des Dichters leben, der einen Tom Jones und eine Sophia erschuf!” In more measured speech, Goethe inquired of Eckermann in his old age: “Whence have come our novels and plays if not from Goldsmith, Fielding, and Shakespeare?” The German novel had really come from Fielding direct and through Goldsmith. This was the view of the man who had seen it all. Goethe perhaps had in mind Wieland who brought the novel out of the wilderness into a new and enlarged world, though he possessed neither the art nor the knowledge of his people necessary to a work of lasting interest. That art and that knowledge belonged only to the author of “Wilhelm Meister,”—a great discursive novel which I shall not attempt to derive from “Tom Jones.”

## CHAPTER XXXIV

### THE FAME OF FIELDING

#### DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

Fielding's fame, in spite of detractors, thus steadily increased at home and abroad for a half-century after his death. English writers of the time who disapproved of his works had to admit that his fame had "not declined"; that Fielding's novels had maintained the great reputation they enjoyed during the author's lifetime. "Tom Jones," I still quote from those who professed to dislike the book, was "a consummate production," "a masterpiece of art, replete with the most striking delineation of manners"; and Mr. Fielding, though it may be lamented, was "the father of novel writing in England." His novels interested France; and they wrought a revolution in German fiction. International recognition so extensive as this was Matthew Arnold's definition of literary glory. Once attained, this glory could not be taken from Fielding; but attempts were made to remove all the bloom. For some years Murphy's essay, many times reprinted, seemed to satisfy public curiosity over the personality of Fielding. Not until after 1800 did anyone feel the need of a new biography. By that time a number of writers, as we have quoted them, had passed judgment upon the novels, several new anecdotes were in circulation, and Mrs. Barbauld collected in 1804 the correspondence of Richardson containing, while much else was omitted, nearly all that related to Fielding. If the letters about Fielding told the truth, he was a despicable character having the manners of a man bred in the stable.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

These letters were published by Mrs. Barbauld, a clever Richardsonian, without comment and with evident satisfaction. They were accepted by her nonconformist brother Dr. John Aikin, who wrote of "Jonathan Wild" in his sketch of Fielding for his "General Biography" (1804): "It displays a familiarity with the scenes of low profligacies, which it is extraordinary a person in decent life should ever acquire. But there is no doubt that his [Fielding's] course of early licentiousness and extravagance had laid an unhappy foundation for too much knowledge of this kind." There was, we see, a sort of reversion through Richardson to the abuse that was heaped upon Fielding during his lifetime. The defamers, however, mainly relied upon Murphy whose sentences and phrases they lifted out of their context and then gave them a meaning never intended by the author. And when they had sufficiently degraded Fielding's character, it was quite easy to condemn all that the man had ever written. Literary dishonesty could go no further.

Fielding, whose first biographer had been an Irishman, now fell into the hands of a Scot named William Watson. This man, a Presbyterian still nourishing Jacobite prejudices, was employed in 1807 by some Edinburgh publishers to write "The Life of Henry Fielding, Esq., with Observations on his Character and Writings." The essay in question, besides forming an introduction to "The Select Works of Henry Fielding, Esq.," which they were then bringing out, was considered of sufficient importance to be enlarged and published separately the same year. This is the first biography of Fielding to appear in a volume by itself. In preparation for his task Watson read the novels but not the plays; he read two or three pamphlets more than Murphy reprinted, but he did not read the "Miscellanies," no copy of which, so far as he could discover, then existed; he sought to give the impression that he read

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

Fielding's newspapers, but his knowledge of them, and of the controversies they occasioned, was derived wholly from "The Gentleman's Magazine"; he read the preface to La Place's translation of "Tom Jones," but he did not look at the translation itself; he collected several of the hostile estimates of Fielding, but neglected most of those that were friendly; he searched the periodicals for some mention of Fielding's death, but could find none (though "The Gentleman's Magazine" and others had the usual notice), and so he concluded that Fielding was almost forgotten after his departure for Lisbon. "An estate at Stower," which Fielding squandered away, was placed in "Derbyshire." It was a simple undertaking to write a biography in those days. Watson's aim was to show "that Fielding, though immersed in pleasure and often enslaved by passion, possessed after all, a latent worth, which in a great measure redeems his character." Owing to his goodness of heart, the author of "Tom Jones" frequently performed, Watson declared, "actions that would have done honour to those who were more conspicuous for their virtue." It would be unfair, he thought, to infer from Fielding's works as a whole, however much some of them should be reprobated, that they were produced by a man "familiar with the last stages of vice."

Watson had no difficulty in developing and proving his thesis. With an air of perfect candour, he set out and went on to the end through a series of antithetical assertions, like those which I have just quoted and imitated; wherein one part of the sentence tends to neutralize or destroy the other. If it suited his purpose to reaffirm Murphy's statements, he reaffirmed them; if they were at variance with his thesis, he altered them by means of paraphrases that should say what he desired or he substituted others for them. Nor did self-contradiction have any terror for him. Eager to prove that Fielding's plays were unpopular as well as

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

worthless, he asserted that "not more than two or three of his farces continued long to be acted," though Murphy said in 1762 "that many of them are still acted every winter." Not satisfied with having the young playwright compose a farce in the course of two or three mornings, he added: "It is even said, that he was known, more than once, after passing the evening with his convivial friends, to have shewn them in the morning a farce of three Acts, that he had written during the hours they had devoted to sleep." From dramatic pieces so hastily constructed, it is clear, Watson went on to say, that Fielding "never derived any very substantial benefits." And yet when the biographer wished to describe the young man midway in an "unrestrained career of dissipation," he had to find the where-withal for the spendthrift; accordingly Fielding's plays, we are then told, were "a source of great emolument to him."

Fielding's novels, it was admitted, were superior to Smollett's, but Smollett turned the laugh against his rival in the newspaper war. Fielding was probably sincere in his political opinions, but they were all erroneous. Watson declared that *Amelia* was a portrait of Fielding's second wife about whom nothing else could be ascertained, and afterwards quoted, without comment, Lady Mary's remark that the character was drawn from his first wife. In conceding an "amiable side" to Fielding's character, Watson paraphrased Murphy: "Every circumstance connected with the happiness of his family, seems to have warmly interested him. His wife and his children appear always to have been the first objects of his regard." But when it became necessary to explain the profligate's intense grief over the death of Charlotte Cradock, he devised a reason out of his own wicked heart. He then remarked of Fielding: "He could not but be alive to the justice of the reflections which must have been thrown on him by mankind, of

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

having, by his imprudent and irregular way of life, embittered, if not shortened, the days of his wife: . . . Every feeling of sympathy and regret, which was displayed by others for the object of his affection, must have served to awaken the recollection of his demerit, and to reproach him with having sacrificed, for the most contemptible gratifications, the welfare and happiness of one who should in a particular manner have been the object of his care and anxiety during life."

Three years after Watson's infamous performance, appeared the well-known series of "British Novelists" edited by Mrs. Barbauld with a general essay on the "Origin and Progress of Novel Writing" and briefer essays on the various novelists. Of Fielding she chose "Tom Jones" and "Joseph Andrews," omitting "Amelia," which she held to be "inferior" to the others. Her "biographical and critical" essay on Fielding she prefixed to "Joseph Andrews." Mrs. Barbauld, the widow of a nonconformist clergyman, was a very refined and well-educated woman. She published poems and essays, popular in their day, and she is still remembered, not only for her edition of Richardson's letters but much more for her "Life," a noble poem found in most anthologies. She was one of the Blue-Stockings or "literary women" of the period. Like her brother Dr. Aikin, she was rather sceptical of the religious fervour of those who held to the Established Church and she accepted the tradition of her sect that Fielding was a very bad man. Evidence that he possessed some most admirable qualities rather puzzled her; and to be on the safe side she sometimes restated in more chastened phrases Murphy's eulogy of Fielding's merits. She could not understand, for example, how Fielding, being the wretch that he was, could have been constant to his wife. Murphy's words, as I have previously quoted them, were: "Though disposed to gallantry by his strong animal spirits, . . . he

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

was remarkable for tenderness and constancy to his wife, and the strongest affection for his children.” Mrs. Barbauld paraphrased the sentence, her brother Dr. Aikin concurring,\* to read: “Though he might not be a very faithful, he was a very affectionate husband, as well as a very fond father.” Thus by a little skilful jugglery, a strict moralist converted a constant husband into a libertine. On the score of Fielding’s religion, Mrs. Barbauld immediately subjoined: “By seeing much of the vicious part of mankind, professionally in his latter years and by choice in his earlier, his mind received a taint which spread itself in his works, but was powerfully counteracted by the better sensibilities of his nature. Notwithstanding his irregularities, he was not without a sense of religion, and had collected materials for an *Answer to Lord Bolingbroke’s posthumous works*, in which he would probably have been much out of his depth.”

The real source of Mrs. Barbauld’s animus against Fielding appears in her discussion of the novels. She knew them well and appreciated much in them, though her preference lay with the more ideal characters of Richardson. Her main quarrel with Fielding was over his treatment of the literary woman. “Any portion of learning in women,” she remarked, “is constantly united in this author with something disagreeable. It is given to Jenny, the supposed mother of Jones. It is given in a higher degree to that very disgusting character Mrs. Bennet in ‘*Amelia*’; Mrs. Western, too, is a woman of reading. A man of licentious manners, and such was Fielding, seldom respects the sex.” The occasion for this feminine outburst was the character of Sophia Western, “very beautiful, very sweet-tempered,” but very indiscreet in her conduct, due, it is implied, to a mind unfortified by books. For Fanny Andrews, who could not read at all, Mrs. Barbauld had no word of praise; and

\* See article on Fielding in his “*General Biography*.”

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

Amelia, who placed the welfare of her husband and children above literary conversation with Mrs. Bennet, she looked upon with contempt as a profligate's "model of female perfection." So she took care that the novel containing the obedient housewife should not be included in her series. With a parting thrust, Fielding's alleged dislike of learned women was attributed to jealousy of "the coterie of literary and accomplished ladies that generally assembled at his rival's house," that is, at Richardson's house in Hammersmith. This is all very lively and clever; but Fielding, who aimed to portray women as they were in his time, could not reasonably be expected to please a "literary woman" fifty years after.

Mrs. Barbauld's essay is a thoroughly feminine production. Such offences as she committed against Fielding ought to be condoned, for she should be allowed to vent her spite on a writer who surely would have amused himself with the Blue-Stockings had they existed when he wrote "Amelia." She may be pardoned, too, for blackening that man's character, even though a little downright dishonesty be involved in the process. But the case is quite different with William Mudford, who edited the next year a rival series of "British Novelists" having biographical sketches for each author and critical prefaces for each novel. Mudford, who was then a young man, afterwards attained some reputation as journalist and contributor to "Blackwood's Magazine." He had already written two novels and had shown in his "Critical Enquiry into the Writings of Dr. Samuel Johnson" that "the 'Rambler' and other publications of that celebrated writer have a dangerous tendency." The situation, then, was this. Johnson had feared the corrupting influence of Fielding, and Mudford in turn feared the corrupting influence of Johnson. It was this man of impregnable morality who now directed his talents to the misrepresentation of Fielding. He condemned his

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

character alike in youth and in maturity. “No man of genius,” he declared, “perhaps ever sunk deeper in vice and folly than Fielding. There is every reason to believe, however, that his errors were the errors of a man whose passions were too strong for his virtue. He had what is commonly called a good heart, but instead of regulating its impulses by the sober application of his reason, he suffered his reason to be subdued and blinded by them, till, at last, what was originally only accidental deviations, became the fixed and settled habits of his life.” Fielding, it is said elsewhere, lived without labour so long as he could sponge upon his friends; and when he was cast off by them he took up in succession play-writing and novel-writing in order to gratify the urgent appetites of the flesh. He was a man steeped in sensuality.

Mudford likewise condemned, with minor reservations, every one of Fielding’s novels, every one of his characters, his ungrammatical style, and his insipid moralizing. Though he had laughed at the blunders of Parson Adams, he was ashamed of himself for having done so. Tom Jones was a detestable young man who prostituted himself to “the superannuated desires of Lady Bellaston.” Sophia Western was a voluptuary’s ideal of a woman. Of Squire Western, the moralist remarked: “I will not deny, that there may be great truth in the outline, and great exactness in the filling up: so there may be both of these in the description of a brothel and its scenes; but who desires to see them faithfully exhibited?” To Mudford as well as to Mrs. Barbauld all of Fielding’s literary women were utterly abhorrent. His surmise was that Fielding had perhaps observed “the pernicious consequences” of “female learning” in his sister Sarah, who, I suppose, let his stockings go undarned or his dinner uncooked in order to finish her book. For the complete failure of “Amelia,” Mudford gave a novel reason. “I do not wish,” he said, “to degrade the

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

married state; but its dull and monotonous insipidity, its unvarying qualities, and its undignified passions, suit but ill with those scenes and descriptions which aim at seizing the heart by a resistless appeal to the feelings.” And against the view of some critics who would exalt the style of Fielding “as a faultless model for imitation,” he declared that the novelist seemed to him “to have studied the art of writing, with very little attention,” else he would not have sprinkled his pages with *hath* and *doth* and such phrases as “to say the truth” and numerous other “inelegancies.” Finally, the reader was warned against Fielding’s wearisome initial chapters. Thus concluded the admonition: “Johnson has advised, that whoever would read Shakespeare with benefit and delight, should never suffer his attention to be distracted by the quibbles or researches of his commentators; and whoever wishes to enjoy the narrative of Fielding, will do well to abstain from perusing his preliminary patches of criticism and argument.”

If it be, as one may reasonably suppose, the object of a critical introduction to whet the public appetite and so increase the sale of an author’s works, Mudford’s publishers, I fear, met with some disappointment. The business of editing was better understood by Alexander Chalmers, a man of more serene temper. He was a Scot, well educated and well read, who passed the greater part of his life in London in journalism and miscellaneous writing. No other man of the time edited so many books; and none was more expert at the work. When engaged to edit the works of Fielding in 1806, he saw, though he knew more about Fielding than any other man then living, that there was not enough material at hand for a new biography, and so he did the obvious thing. He reissued Murphy’s essay as the introduction, accompanied by such comment as he deemed necessary. Chalmers’s footnotes, marked with a C., have long since become an integral part of Murphy’s essay.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Among other things Chalmers added a few facts—not always facts—relative to Fielding's career, some of which were taken from Murphy's original file of “The Covent-Garden Journal” then in his possession. He scored Richardson and his correspondents for their ill-natured remarks on Fielding, and disagreed with the comparatively low estimate which Murphy placed upon “*Amelia*,” a novel abounding “with exquisite touches of nature and passion.” Six years later his friend John Nichols included a sketch and estimate of Fielding, admirable in tone, in the third volume of his “*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*,” and in 1814 Chalmers himself wrote for “*The General Biographical Dictionary*,” which he was editing, the best short account of Fielding that had yet appeared. Though these men were compelled to rely mainly on Murphy, they had no motive to misread him. They collected such other information as could be readily procured and seem to have made use of an unpublished sketch of Fielding which Dr. Andrew Kippis had prepared back in 1793 for the “*Biographia Britannica*”—a work which suspended publication just before the name of Fielding was reached. Nichols described Fielding as “an author of great eminence”; and Chalmers as “beyond all comparison the first novelist of this country.”

With these opinions, most men of letters of the time agreed. On them a Mudford or a Watson could make no impression. Coleridge, as I have already quoted him, accepted Fielding almost entirely, confining his criticism, moral as well as literary, to mere matters of detail.\* Byron named Fielding “*the prose Homer of human nature*.† His friend Tom Moore, after reading “*Joseph Andrews*,”

\* “*Complete Works*,” edited by Shedd, New York, 1884, IV, 379-383; “*Specimens of the Table Talk of S. T. Coleridge*,” second edition, 1836, p. 310; “*The Friend*,” No. 3, Aug. 10, 1809, pp. 44-45.

† Moore's “*Life of Byron*,” 1832, V, 55.

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

similarly remarked, "How well Fielding knew human nature"; and amusing himself on "a dreadfully wet" day with "A Journey from this World to the Next," he noted in his diary as he laid the book aside,\* "Few things so good as the first half of it." Southey, who considered Richardson the immoral writer par excellence, chuckled over Fielding's exposure of him in "Joseph Andrews." The real Fielding, patient and triumphant over disease, he saw in "A Voyage to Lisbon" and regretted that he had failed to collect in his youth, as he then might have done, fresh facts for a biography of him.† Hazlitt, who wrote more at large on Fielding, praised him for the skill with which he probed the eternal passions of mankind while maintaining perfect fidelity in all exteriors to the characters of men and women "as he saw them existing." Of Fielding he said:

"He has brought together a greater variety of characters in common life,—marked with more distinct peculiarities, and without an atom of caricature, than any other novel writer whatever. The extreme subtility of observation on the springs of human conduct in ordinary characters, is only equalled by the ingenuity of contrivance in bringing those springs into play, in such a manner as to lay open their smallest irregularity. The detection is always complete—and made with the certainty and skill of a philosophical experiment, and the ease and simplicity of a casual observation. The truth of the imitation is indeed so great, that it has been argued that Fielding must have had his materials ready-made to his hands, and was merely a transcriber of local manners and individual habits. For this conjecture, however, there seems to be no foundation.

\* "Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence," edited by Lord John Russell, 1853-1856, II, 208, and IV, 250.

† "Correspondence of Robert Southey with Caroline Bowles," edited by Dowden, 1881, pp. 184, 198; and "Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey," 1856, II, 296-297.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

His representations, it is true, are local and individual; but they are not the less profound and natural. The feeling of the general principles of human nature, operating in particular circumstances, is always intense, and uppermost in his mind.”\*

The moral of “Tom Jones” Hazlitt thought had been assailed “without much reason”; but he conceded that there might be, inasmuch as manners had changed greatly since Fielding’s time, some objection “to the want of refinement and elegance in the two principal characters.” He foresaw a time when, alehouses being no more, fastidious readers would no longer find pleasure in Fielding; but he adds: “People of sense and imagination, who look beyond the surface or the passing folly of the day, will always read ‘Tom Jones.’” Similarly, Charles Lamb, who was not wholly at ease in the “low life” described by Fielding, felt that the moral eye might rest satisfied on many of his characters. “One cordial honest laugh of a Tom Jones absolutely clears the atmosphere that was reeking with the black putrifying breathings of a hypocrite Blifil. . . . One ‘Lord bless us!’ of Parson Adams upon the wickedness of the times, exorcises and purges off the mass of iniquity which the world knowledge of even a Fielding could cull out and rake together.”†

The time had now arrived when judgment was to be passed upon Fielding by his peers. Naturally many minor novelists besides Cumberland, Godwin, and others whom I have quoted, had spoken for or against him. Charlotte Smith, for example, in introducing to the reader the portrait of a rascally attorney in her “Marchmont” (1796), commended the zeal with which “the great master of novel-writing” had attacked the legal pestilence raging in his

\* “Collected Works,” edited by Waller and Glover, 1904, X, 32, and XII, 374.

† “The Works of Charles and Mary Lamb,” edited by Lucas, 1903, I, 83.

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

own day. And Mary Brunton in her "Self-Control" (1810) let her characters discuss the question whether Tom Jones would make a good husband. The conclusion seems to have been that Tom was not religious enough for a safe trial. "It is unfortunate for the morality of the book," says Montreville, "that the reader is inclined to excuse the want of religion in the hero, by seeing its language made ridiculous in Thwackum, and villainous in Blifil." But the casual remarks of these writers, while interesting, are overshadowed by the opinions of two novelists reckoned among the foremost of the nineteenth century.

Sir Walter Scott the romancer was not a follower of Fielding. He used to say that his novels dealing with Scotch life were inspired by Maria Edgeworth; that his aim in "Waverley" and the rest was to depict the characters and manners of Scotland much as she had depicted the national characteristics of Ireland. He admired, however, the constructive art displayed in "Tom Jones," which he despaired of ever attaining. He might lay out, he said, a plot by compass and rule but he was never able to follow it. So he allowed his novel to develop as it would in the act of composition, and he left the consequences to chance. He had reached, for example, the last chapters of "Rob Roy" before he saw that if Francis Osbaldistone was to be rewarded by the hand of Diana Vernon a fortune must be found for the young gentleman. As it happened, the only way to give him a fortune was to make him the heir to his uncle Sir Hildebrand. But unfortunately several strong, healthy sons of the old knight were still living. There were, I think, five or six of them. The number, whatever it was, did not daunt Scott. One by one he rid his plot of them, letting them die a violent death or quietly in bed, until they were all gone and the novel could conclude. On the other hand, Fielding, trained in the drama, always had in mind his catastrophe, which kept his characters from drift-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ing into situations from which they could be extricated only by some clever device. This ability of Fielding to move on, despite digressions, to his goal, Scott viewed with wonder. Other novelists like Smollett and himself, he said, arrived at a conclusion, only "because a tale must have an end—just as the traveller alights at the inn because it is evening."\*\* Probably one may see more of Fielding in Scott's first novel than in any other. "*Waverley*" has the same historical background as "*Tom Jones*"—the Jacobite insurrection of 1745; and the situation of the lovers is analogous in the two novels. Though the romancer in this instance wound up with his premeditated conclusion, his narrative had meanwhile fallen into the utmost confusion. Scott possessed marvellous powers of the imagination beyond the range of Fielding, but he yielded the palm to his predecessor when it came to a natural and logical development of a story. Fielding, he said, was the first to transform loose adventures into a new and wonderful art. For this reason he called him the "*Father of the English Novel.*"

Aside from this cordial tribute to his art, Scott rarely warmed towards Fielding. The two men were of different temper, different culture, and different country. Scott, who read extensively in history and romance, disliked the ancient literatures and thought Fielding a pedant for quoting and imitating them. Living in the past almost as much as in the present, he could never forget Culloden, where members of his own family had bled; nor could he forgive Fielding's denunciation of the Jacobites. "Of all the works of imagination, to which English genius has given origin," he said, "the writings of Henry Fielding are, perhaps, most decidedly her own." These are fine words which convey without offence the idea that Fielding was narrowly English in sentiment and outlook. The man who wrote

\* Introductory Epistle to "*The Fortunes of Nigel.*"

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

“Tom Jones” was indeed intensely English, just as the author of “Waverley” was intensely Scotch. Both were extreme patriots. Hence Scott’s absurd endeavour to make out a case for Smollett against Fielding in that essay on Smollett which he wrote for Ballantyne’s Novelist’s Library. For the same series he contributed in 1820 an introduction to Fielding’s novels, which does the author no credit as a biographer either on the score of accuracy or candour. The truth is, Scott made but little effort to inform himself about Fielding. He read Murphy and Watson, collected a few details, hit-or-miss, from other sources, and then sat down and paraphrased Watson, avoiding of course that gentleman’s excessive vulgarity.

According to Scott, Fielding was both “the only son” and “the third son” of Edmund Fielding by his first wife. This is all in a single paragraph. He began his London career as “a man of wit and pleasure about town, seeking and finding amusement in scenes of gaiety and dissipation.” In order to live this life, he had recourse to the stage for which he wrote a number of plays; and “for a season” he was manager of a company composed of “discarded comedians”; but his plays met with no success and his company had to be disbanded. He married and dissipated a fortune at Watson’s “Stower in Derbyshire.” He subsequently studied law, but he had no business, for clients hesitated to entrust their cases to a man of pleasure; “and it is said that Fielding’s own conduct was such as to justify their want of confidence.” Very soon “disease, the consequence of a free life, came to the aid of dissipation of mind,” and Fielding’s legal career was over. “Necessity of subsistence” then compelled him to return to literature. He wrote novels, conducted newspapers, and put forth pamphlets without number. One of his newspapers was “called ‘The Jacobite Journal,’ the object of which was to eradicate those feelings and sentiments which had been already so

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

effectually crushed upon the Field of Culloden." For the zeal which he displayed in the interest of the House of Brunswick, the long neglected patriot eventually "received a small pension, together with the then disreputable office of a Justice of Peace for Westminster and Middlesex, of which he was at liberty to make the best he could by the worst means he might choose."

Throughout his essay Scott sought to degrade Fielding wherever he could, careless of inconsistency and contradiction. He quoted the worst that Richardson said of Fielding and rightly set it all down to personal animosity; but he later declared that Charlotte Cradock was "a natural child"—an assertion for which Richardson was his sole authority. On Fielding's deep grief over the loss of his wife, Scott felt constrained to remark that "the violence of the emotion, however, was transient." The story of Lady Bellaston he regarded, we have seen, as evidence "that Fielding's ideas of what was gentleman-like and honourable had sustained some depreciation, in consequence of the unhappy circumstances of his life, and of the society to which they condemned him." As a matter of fact, the Lady Bellastons belonged to those people of fashion for whom Fielding had the utmost contempt. Again, Scott quoted from Horace Walpole the Rigby anecdote; and though he surmised that the "blind man" at Fielding's table was really his brother John, afterwards knighted, he employed it to give point to "the lowness" of Fielding's "society and habits." If any further illustration of Scott's biographical method is desired, it may be found in his account of the composition of "Tom Jones." This novel, it will be recalled, was written during years of comparative leisure and was nearly if not quite completed before Fielding assumed the office of justice of the peace for Westminster. "The History of a Foundling," Scott said, "was composed under all the disadvantages incident to an author

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

alternately pressed by the disagreeable task of his magisterial duties, and by the necessity of hurrying out some ephemeral essay or pamphlet to meet the demands of the passing day." Then he immediately added: "It is inscribed to the Hon. Mr. Lyttelton, afterwards Lord Lyttelton, with a dedication, in which he [Fielding] intimates that without his assistance, and that of the Duke of Bedford, the work had never been completed, as the author had been indebted to them for the means of subsistence while engaged in composing it." The first sentence was taken from Watson; the second is an inaccurate paraphrase of Fielding's own words. Scott never stopped to reconcile the inconsistency, but went right on to describe still further "the precarious circumstances," wholly imaginary, in which "Tom Jones" was given to the public.

Dismissing the man, Scott dealt out to the novels praise and blame with a free hand. The unrelieved villainy of "Jonathan Wild" he disliked; and the ascription of "a train of fictitious adventures to a real character" he regarded as bad art. Still, Fielding's peculiar genius shone, he admitted, in the conversation between Jonathan and the Ordinary of Newgate. The discovery of several very affecting scenes in "Amelia" came as a surprise to Scott, for men like Fielding who are forced by circumstances to view human misery close at hand, he said strangely, "become necessarily, in some degree, hardened to its effects." The suffering wife, however, failed to engage the reader's sympathy because of "her unthankful helpmate, of whose conversion we have no hope." Taken as a whole, then, "Amelia" was "unpleasing" despite "the doughty Colonel Bath, and the learned Dr. Harrison, characters drawn with such force and precision, as Fielding alone knew how to employ." On the other hand, "Joseph Andrews" received Scott's full praise "for the admirable pictures of manners which it presents, and, above all, for the inimitable char-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

acter of Mr. Abraham Adams." Likewise "Tom Jones," the novel of Fielding's which Scott best knew, was commended at most points. Could he have had his own way, he would have removed, however, the Man of the Hill. He would also have deleted Lady Bellaston, and not permitted Squire Western to take a beating, without resistance, from the friend of Lord Fellamar. It was not altogether pleasant for Scott to see a Jacobite gentleman given a touch of cowardice though in jest.

With the moralists who feared the disastrous effect of Tom Jones upon young men, Scott took issue, calling their attention to the fact "that the vices into which Jones suffers himself to fall, are made the direct cause of placing him in the distressful situation which he occupies during the greater part of the narrative; while his generosity, his charity, and his amiable qualities, become the means of saving him from the consequences of his folly." It was a fixed belief with Scott that people overestimate the influence of fiction for good as well as for evil. "The vices and follies of Tom Jones," he said, "are those which the world soon teaches to all who enter on the career of life, and to which society is unhappily but too indulgent, nor do we believe that, in any one instance, the perusal of Fielding's novel has added one libertine to the large list, who would not have been such, had it never crossed the press. And it is with concern we add our sincere belief, that the fine picture of frankness and generosity, exhibited in that fictitious character, has had as few imitators as the career of his follies. Let it not be supposed that we are indifferent to morality, because we treat with scorn that affectation which, while in common life it connives at the open practice of libertinism, pretends to detest the memory of an author who painted life as it was, with all its shades, and more than all the lights which it occasionally exhibits, to relieve them." This passage, written under the sway of sincere

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

emotion, atones for all the blunders and prejudices of Scott which I have recorded. The pity is that he should have supposed that “*Tom Jones*” could have been written by the kind of man whom he had previously described.

Thackeray has been called another Fielding—or Fielding properly refined to the standards of the mid-Victorians. The world has long recognized the kinship of Jonathan Wild and Barry Lyndon, Tom Jones and Arthur Pendennis, *Amelia* Booth and *Amelia* Sedley, and of a humour that unmasks affectation and a humour that unmasks the snob. Thackeray read, as I have observed, “*Joseph Andrews*” in his school-days, and illuminated his copy of the novel—it was a first edition—with droll sketches of Parson Adams, Joseph, and Lady Booby.\* Fielding, however, meant very little to Thackeray until 1840, when he was twenty-nine years old. In that year he reviewed for the London “*Times*” the new edition of Fielding’s works issued in a single volume with a memoir by Thomas Roscoe, the well-known translator. Roscoe made greater use than anyone else had done of the preface to the “*Miscellanies*,” he appraised Fielding’s poems at their full value, he examined several of the pamphlets, and saw clearly that Fielding had rendered distinguished public services as magistrate and political writer. But he accepted, though he toned them down, all the stories ever told about Fielding; he misread his authorities, he neglected chronology, and so fell into the most egregious blunders. In short, though he aimed to present a just estimate of Fielding’s works and character, his memoir on the score of fact is utterly worthless.

In the summer of 1840, Thackeray took Roscoe’s ponderous volume with him to Margate, whither he went with his wife, who was beginning to show signs of that hopeless malady from which she never recovered. He became so absorbed in Fielding that he neglected for a full month “*A*

\* “*Thackerayana*,” 1875, pp. 74-77.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Shabby Genteel Story," which he was then writing. He used to walk out, he told Mrs. Brookfield long after, to a little sunshiny arbour in a bowling-green, and there read and write about Fielding, with no money in his pocket though there were two little children besides a wife to support; and then he would return home and wonder "what was the melancholy oppressing the poor little woman." His review of Roscoe's volume appeared in "The Times" for September 2, 1840.\* From this article he later drew for the lecture on Fielding in "The English Humourists," first given in the summer of 1851. Review and lecture do not agree in all respects. Lady Bellaston, for example, he slipped over in 1840, while she troubled him in 1851. But on minor disagreements it is unnecessary to insist; it is sufficient to say that Thackeray's earlier appreciation of Fielding was on the whole more buoyant and spontaneous but far less complete than the one prepared for a public audience in his full maturity.

Fielding's plays Thackeray merely looked at and pronounced them, on Roscoe's authority, "irretrievably immoral." "They are not remarkable for wit," he remarked, "even though they have a great deal of *spirits*: a great deal too much perhaps." Thackeray could not have read "Tom Thumb," "Pasquin," and "The Author's Farce," pieces where the wit never flags. "Joseph Andrews," which he reread later, gave him then "no particular pleasure," for it appeared to be "both coarse and careless." Of "Tom Jones" he said in "The Times":

"Moral or immoral, let any man examine this romance as a work of art merely, and it must strike him as the most astonishing production of human ingenuity. There is not an incident ever so trifling, but advances the story, grows out of former incidents, and is connected with the whole. Such a literary *providence*, if we may use such a word, is

\* Reprinted in "Stray Papers," 1901.

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

not to be seen in any other work of fiction. You might cut out half of *Don Quixote*, or add, transpose, or alter any given romance of *Walter Scott*, and neither would suffer. *Roderick Random* and heroes of that sort run through a series of adventures, at the end of which the fiddles are brought, and there is a marriage. But the history of *Tom Jones* connects the very first page with the very last, and it is marvellous to think how the author could have built and carried all this structure in his brain, as he must have done, before he began to put it to paper."

But Thackeray's favourite was always "*Amelia*." "The picture of *Amelia*, in the story of that name," he wrote in 1840, "is (in the writer's humble opinion), the most beautiful and delicious description of a character that is to be found in any writer, not excepting *Shakespeare*." In 1848 he declared in a letter to *Mrs. Brookfield* that she was "the most delightful portrait of a woman that surely was ever painted"; and in "*The English Humourists*" he elaborated the same opinion, saying: "To have invented that character, is not only a triumph of art, but it is a good action. They say it was in his own home that *Fielding* knew her and loved her: and from his own wife that he drew the most charming character in English fiction. Fiction! why fiction? why not history? I know *Amelia* just as well as *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*." And so we have Thackeray exclaiming in his summary:

"What a wonderful art! what an admirable gift of nature was it by which the author of these tales was endowed, and which enabled him to fix our interest, to awaken our sympathy, to seize upon our credulity, so that we believe in his people—speculate gravely upon their faults or their excellences. . . . What a genius! what a vigour! what a bright-eyed intelligence and observation! what a wholesome hatred for meanness and knavery! what a vast sympathy! what a cheerfulness! what a manly relish of life! what a love of

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

human kind! what a poet is here!—watching, meditating, brooding, creating! What multitudes of truths has that man left behind him! What generations he has taught to laugh wisely and fairly! What scholars he has formed and accustomed to the exercise of thoughtful humour and the manly play of wit! What a courage he had! What a dauntless and constant cheerfulness of intellect, that burned bright and steady through all the storms of his life, and never deserted its last wreck.”

And on the man’s character:

“Stained as you see him, and worn by care and dissipation, that man retains some of the most precious and splendid human qualities and endowments. He has an admirable natural love of truth, the keenest instinctive antipathy to hypocrisy, the happiest satirical gift of laughing it to scorn. His wit is wonderfully wise and detective; it flashes upon a rogue and lightens up a rascal like a policeman’s lantern. He is one of the manliest and kindliest of human beings: in the midst of all his imperfections, he respects female innocence and infantine tenderness, as you would suppose such a great-hearted, courageous soul would respect and care for them. He could not be so brave, generous, truth-telling as he is, were he not infinitely merciful, pitiful, and tender. He will give any man his purse—he can’t help kindness and profusion. He may have low tastes, but not a mean mind; he admires with all his heart good and virtuous men, stoops to no flattery, bears no rancour, disdains all disloyal arts, does his public duty uprightly, is fondly loved by his family, and dies at his work.”

This is the most eloquent tribute that had ever been paid to the genius and character of Fielding. But the passages which I have quoted do not give, when taken by themselves, the prevailing tone either of the review or of the lecture. In both Thackeray was frankly apologetic of Fielding the

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

man. Even here at the height of his eulogy, he stains Fielding's ruffles and laced coat with claret, though they appear immaculate in the frontispiece to Roscoe's volume. The man's handsome face, too, he describes as worn by dissipation, and we are told that he probably had "low tastes" despite his wonderful endowments of head and heart. Elsewhere Thackeray dwells more upon Fielding's imperfections, taking them as he found them in Roscoe or giving them a new turn or interpretation. All those splendid qualities which excited his admiration and love as he read the novels, he had to adjust to Roscoe's account of Fielding's career which he supposed to be true. So Thackeray retold in his own beautiful English the old story of Fielding's wild and dissipated life from youth to middle age, with the addition of those many little details which he thought necessary to a perfect work of literary art. His attitude towards Fielding was not that of a biographer; it was that of a novelist. The portrait which he drew is so fine as a literary creation that all the world, except for an occasional doubter, has accepted it as the real Fielding.

His Fielding, however, was fashioned partly out of tradition, and partly out of the lives of two characters in the novels, whom he completely identified with their author. "He is," he said of Fielding, "himself the hero of his books; he is wild Tom Jones, he is wild Captain Booth; less wild, I am glad to think, than his predecessor; at least heartily conscious of demerit, and anxious to amend." Moreover, Thackeray put a piece of himself into his Fielding. "Doesn't the apology for Fielding," he wrote to Mrs. Brookfield, "read like an apology for somebody else too?" And when all else failed, he gave free rein to his fancy. Fielding, as Thackeray portrayed him, was a profligate, a spendthrift, a heavy drinker, in youth noisy and quarrelsome over his cups, and the associate of loose women, though he knew, for there is Amelia, a good one when he

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

saw her. It is taken as a matter of course that he was a gambler. On how shaky a foundation Thackeray builded, was shown a few years ago by Mr. Dickson.\* Two or three examples will illustrate the novelist's method.

“Harry Fielding,” Thackeray said of the young playwright, “began to run into debt and borrow money in that easy manner in which Captain Booth borrows money in the novel: was in nowise particular in accepting a few pieces from the purses of his rich friends, and bore down upon more than one of them, as Walpole tells us only too truly, for a dinner or a guinea. To supply himself with the latter, he began to write theatrical pieces, having already, no doubt, a considerable acquaintance amongst the Oldfields and Bracegirdles behind the scenes. He laughed at these pieces and scorned them.”

From 1730 to 1737, Fielding did live mainly by his plays, just as a century later Thackeray lived by his miscellaneous writings, complaining, just as his predecessor sometimes complained, if he did not receive as much as he would have liked for his work. “*The Times*,” Thackeray wrote to Mrs. Brookfield of his review of Roscoe’s edition of Fielding, “gave me five guineas for the article. I recollect I thought it rather shabby pay.” If it was not very creditable, as is implied, for Fielding to write for the week’s bread, it was also not very creditable for Thackeray to do likewise. And far from scorning his plays, Fielding regretted that his dramatic career was cut short by the Licensing Act. Presumably Fielding like all men had to borrow money, but there is no warrant for the assertion that he was as reckless as Captain Booth in this regard. He doubtless received the usual five or ten guineas for a dedication, and probably Ralph Allen later made him a handsome present; but he did not bear down on his friend; for the two hundred pounds which Allen is supposed to

\* “*The North American Review*,” April, 1913, pp. 522-537.

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

have given him was sent, according to the story, without solicitation. When he was at Bath, he dined, it is said, almost every day with Allen, not because he was unable to procure a dinner elsewhere, but because the two men enjoyed each other's company to the utmost.

Had he wished, Fielding could not have been intimate with "the Oldfields and Bracegirdles behind the scenes." Mrs. Bracegirdle, though she survived until 1748, took final leave of the stage in 1709, when Fielding was but two years old. Mrs. Oldfield indeed played Lady Matchless in Fielding's first comedy, "Love in Several Masques." But three weeks later the young man left for Leyden, and the actress died a few months after his return, in her forty-eighth year. Mrs. Bracegirdle was then above sixty years of age, while Fielding was just above twenty. Mrs. Oldfield he knew slightly; Mrs. Bracegirdle he probably never met. If Thackeray had stopped to think, he never would have hinted that Harry Fielding had "a considerable acquaintance" with these old women, perhaps had an intrigue with one or the other of them. The only actress with whom Fielding's name was ever linked was Miss Raftor, afterwards Mrs. Clive. Each contributed to the success of the other. She took the parts he wrote for her; and after her marriage he dedicated "The Intriguing Chambermaid" to "the best wife, the best daughter, the best sister, and the best friend." Fielding evidently knew a good woman when he found her, whether he wanted her for his home or for his theatre.

Neither in his review nor in his lecture did Thackeray give any evidence whatever for the statement that Fielding led "a sad, riotous life, and mixed with many a bad woman in his time." He read too literally Fielding's own life in the careers of Tom Jones and Captain Booth. What these men do he supposed Fielding had done also. No novelist could long maintain his reputation as a gentleman were the follies and vices of his characters to be trans-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ferred in this easy way to himself. How would Thackeray fare under this treatment? May we endow him with all the faults of Arthur Pendennis, Clive Newcome, and George Warrington? Is his Captain Costigan evidence that he preferred the haunts of the vulgar and the profane to the company of decent people? Much might be said, too, of the fact that when Thackeray tried, in imitation of Fielding, to depict a perfect woman he gave the world Amelia Sedley, who is more dead than alive; but when he essayed the adventuress, the result was a superb character. If a balance were struck between the good and the bad women in Fielding and Thackeray, there is no doubt as to how the scales would stand. Becky Sharp and Beatrix Esmond are Thackeray's great feminine creations; Amelia Booth and Sophia Western are Fielding's.

Equally fictitious are those descriptions of Fielding drunk. "His muse," Thackeray said of him at the time "*Joseph Andrews*" was written, "had sung the loudest in tavern choruses, had seen the daylight streaming in over thousands of emptied bowls, and reeled home to chambers on the shoulders of the watchman." This is all sheer rhetoric. As Mr. Dickson has pointed out, quoting "*Amelia*," the watchmen of the period "were poor old decrepit people," without the bodily strength necessary for earning a living by any kind of work. "It required," he remarks, "the abounding imagination of a Thackeray to see such a one bearing homeward the stalwart form of Fielding." When Thackeray introduced the watch into his picture he was thinking, of course, of the policeman of his own time, a descendant of that efficient body of constables which was organized by this same Harry Fielding, the young Mohawk, when he was chief police magistrate for Middlesex. Thackeray's only semblance of an excuse for the imaginary scene was a story which he read in Roscoe or Murphy. These biographers said with slight

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

variation, when they described Fielding's eager pursuit of the law: "Nothing could suppress the thirst he had for knowledge, and the delight he felt in reading; and this prevailed in him to such a degree, that he has been frequently known, by his intimates, to retire late at night from a tavern to his chambers, and there read, and make extracts from, the most abstruse authors, for several hours before he went to bed." This story, which may or may not be true, does indeed bring before the imagination a convivial companion, but it implies moderation rather than excess in drinking. There was certainly no need of a watchman to help Fielding to his chambers.

Reworked in another way the same anecdote was transformed by Thackeray in his review to read: "They say he used to come home from a supper party, and after tying a wet cloth round his head, would begin to read as stoutly as the soberest man in either of the Temples. This is very probable, but there are still better ways of keeping the head cool, which the author of 'Tom Jones' seems to have neglected." Though it was not in the original story, the novelist will have it that Fielding drank heavily on these occasions. But Thackeray knew—for he, too, had been a student at the Middle Temple with chambers near those once occupied by Fielding—that a man with an over-heated head cannot "read, and make abstracts from, the most abstruse authors"; so he cooled Fielding's head "with a wet cloth," afterwards altered to "a wet towel," in order to make the phrase more specific and striking. No one who has once read Thackeray can rid his memory of this wet towel and the other picturesque touches in the portrait of Fielding; of a man in a tarnished laced coat streaked with wine, staggering home from a late dinner under the guidance of the watch, helped up the stairway by a boy who has sat at the foot for hours for the honour, who opens the door for him, and either puts him to bed or places him in a chair by

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the table and provides a wet towel for an aching brain and watches the hand of the master grow steady as it transcribes a passage from a law book or dashes off a leader for "The Covent-Garden Journal." And yet for these melodramatic details Thackeray had no scrap of evidence, beyond the fact that Fielding would sit late with his friends over wine or punch, often dined out like other men, read perhaps more books than any other man of his time, became learned in the law, and wrote thousands of pages.

And there is another passage, hidden away in Thackeray's works, where the romancer takes a wilder flight. The watch, it seems, instead of always assisting Fielding to his chambers, sometimes conveyed him to the roundhouse. On these unfortunate nights we have a view of him sitting alone, "fuddled, most likely," while "in the blandest, easiest, and most good-humoured way in the world," he delineates, taking them from real life, "a number of men and women on so many sheets of paper." If we could look over the master's shoulder we might get a glimpse, Thackeray imagines, of the perfectly lifelike scenes as they are unfolded. "Is not Amelia preparing her husband's little supper? Is not Miss Snap chastely preventing the crime of Mr. Firebrand? Is not Parson Adams in the midst of his family, and Mr. Wild taking his last bowl of punch with the Newgate Ordinary?"\* On the outcome, Thackeray exclaims, "O wondrous power of genius!" And certainly it would be a display of wondrous power, were it true that Fielding composed his novels while "fuddled" and locked up in a sponging-house. When he wrote that scene in "Amelia" to which Thackeray refers, he was a justice of the peace for Middlesex, and had published, only a few months before, a pamphlet denouncing drunkenness as the chief source of theft and robbery.

With the same disregard of truth, Thackeray also dark-

\* "Caricatures and Lithography," in "The Paris Sketch Book."

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

ened the character of Tom Jones; not in the review, where he has little to say of him, but in the lecture, where he perhaps wished to win the moral approbation of one part of his audience while amusing the other. After praising the construction of the novel as “quite a wonder,” Thackeray went on to say:

“But against Mr. Thomas Jones himself we have a right to put in a protest, and quarrel with the esteem the author evidently has for that character. Charles Lamb says finely of Jones, that a single hearty laugh from him ‘clears the air’—but then it is in a certain state of the atmosphere. It might clear the air when such personages as Blifil or Lady Bellaston poison it. But I fear very much that (except until the very last scene of the story), when Mr. Jones enters Sophia’s drawing-room, the pure air there is rather tainted with the young gentleman’s tobacco-pipe and punch. . . . He would not rob a church, but that is all; and a pretty long argument may be debated, as to which of these old types, the spendthrift, the hypocrite, Jones and Blifil, Charles and Joseph Surface,—is the worst member of society and the most deserving of censure. . . . ‘Amelia’ perhaps is not a better story than ‘Tom Jones,’ but it has the better ethics; the prodigal repents at least, before forgiveness,—whereas that odious broad-backed Mr. Jones carries off his beauty with scarce an interval of remorse for his manifold errors and shortcomings. . . . Too much of the plum-cake and rewards of life fall to that boisterous, swaggering young scapegrace.”

The long list of protests closes with a lamentation over Tom’s “fondness for drink and play.”

This is not the Tom Jones of Fielding’s novel. Tom, as his author depicts him, is a boy rather under medium size, of hard muscles, strong enough to thrash a Blifil or unarm an inexpert highwayman; but he does not swagger, nor is he a big fellow with broad back, or “large calves” and

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“broad shoulders,” as Thackeray adds elsewhere. It was Fielding who had the large calves and the broad shoulders. This is where Thackeray found them for the young man. Though generous when he has money, Tom is no spend-thrift. He displays no fondness for drink; so far as we know, he has never tasted punch—that “liquid fire” which Mrs. Honour pours down her throat. Rarely does he drink wine; if on one occasion he takes more than is good for him, it is because of his joy over the recovery of Allworthy. Fielding, as we may see in “The Voyage to Lisbon,” took wine, when he could get it, after dinner, and sometimes a bowl of punch at night if there was anyone to drink it with him. So Thackeray seems to infer that Tom must have had the same habit. Tom does not taint the pure air of Sophia’s drawing-room with tobacco. On the contrary, he is never seen in the novel with a pipe. It was Fielding who, according to the stories told of him, smoked innumerable pipes on a morning. Tom never gambles; nor was Fielding ever accused of the folly by his worst enemies. It is Booth who loses at play. Of course, young gentlemen of the period as well as of later times have spent their nights at the gaming-table. Thackeray, for example, dissipated a fortune of £20,000, the last remnant of which, some £1,500, was transferred to the pocket of a gambler at Spa who beat him at *écarté*. Apparently Thackeray felt justified in endowing Tom Jones with any folly or vice on which Fielding is silent. Since Fielding nowhere says that Tom does not smoke, does not habitually drink wine and punch, and does not gamble, it may be assumed, Thackeray thought, that he was fond of tobacco and drink and play. The only vice he fails to give him is profanity.

In this gross misrepresentation of Tom Jones, that young gentleman is not alone involved. “I can’t say,” Thackeray remarks, “but that I think Fielding’s evident liking and admiration for Mr. Jones shows that the great humorist’s

## DEFAMERS AND APOLOGISTS

moral sense was blunted by his life.” And again, as I have already quoted him, that Fielding is none other than “wild Tom Jones.” By his little fabrications and subtle interplay between Tom Jones, his author, and himself, Thackeray really did more than any other man has ever done to stain the memory of Fielding. For art’s sake he sacrificed the artist.

## CHAPTER XXXV

### THE FAME OF FIELDING

#### LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

Thackeray intended no harm. His appreciation of Fielding's novels was whole-hearted and sincere; it gave Fielding a higher place in the republic of letters than he had enjoyed at any time since his death. If Fielding had lived the disreputable life ascribed to him by the casual biographers whom Thackeray read, no great injury, in the view of a literary artist, could be done by touching up his vices and inventing a few new ones, especially if they were described, as Thackeray described them, on the whole lightly and humorously. Both the review and the lecture were comparatively free from the moral indignation which Fielding's career then awakened in most second-rate critics.

Take, for instance, such an estimate as the one which E. P. Whipple contributed to "The North American Review" for January, 1849. It was an honest piece of criticism. The superb qualities of Fielding's work Whipple saw with almost as clear a vision as did Thackeray. He even went so far as to say of Fielding: "If we consider his mind in respect either to its scope or its healthiness, we do not see how we can avoid placing it above that of any English poet, novelist, or humorist, of his century." But he could not reconcile Fielding's mind with his temperament, which was that of "a rowdy"; his works and his life could not be made to match. It never occurred to Whipple that the tales about Fielding might be untrue. Fielding's

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

“knowledge of the law,” he said, “was principally obtained in experiencing the consequences of its violation”; and if the novelist was ill rewarded for his work, there was consolation in the thought that the world “could not possibly have lavished upon him an amount of wealth which his improvidence would not instantly have wasted.”

One of the anecdotes Whipple slightly amended. He evidently saw, after thinking it over, that Fielding could not have been chewing tobacco and drinking champagne at one and the same time as he sat behind the scenes waiting for the damnation of “*The Wedding Day*.” In the new version Fielding drinks the champagne, “enveloped in tobacco smoke.” The conclusion at which Whipple eventually arrived, after being driven back and forth like a shuttlecock between his own impressions and the biographers, was that the author of “*Joseph Andrews*” must have had in his heart “the germs of a philanthropy as warm and all embracing as ever animated a human breast.” It is indeed something to have virtue’s germs in the breast, though they may not expand and grow for the lack of “high moral and religious aspiration” to fertilize them.

Take also two or three other critics of the time. There is George Gilfillan, the Presbyterian divine who edited the old poets, wrote poems himself, wrote essays and biographies, wrote in all a hundred volumes without neglect, it is said, of his parish duties. This man, who had no leisure to consider his subject, fell foul of Fielding in the third series of his “*Literary Portraits*” (1854), depicting him as “a sad scamp” who aimed to pollute the whole world by reproducing his own vices in “*Tom Jones*,” a novel which “Mr. Thackeray seems to us to over-rate . . . amazingly.” “*Tom Jones*,” he admits, “is a piece of admirable art, but composed of the basest materials, like a palace built of dung.” It was Gilfillan’s prediction that a century later “*Joseph Andrews*” would “alone survive to preserve

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Fielding's name." The next year the Rev. Whitwell Elwin, whose moral fibre was not quite so coarse, had his say in "The Quarterly Review" for December, 1855. Like Whipple, Elwin found difficulty in understanding how this "haunter of taverns and squanderer of thousands" could have composed "Tom Jones," displaying that consummate workmanship which requires time as well as skill; or how he could ever have pursued the dry and arduous study of the law, which in the end proved so "profitless" to him. Not satisfied with the old story as it came to him of Fielding's watches through the night, the critic made it read: "He would sit up for hours on returning late to his chambers, and snatch from sleep the time he had given to riot." With a stroke of the pen Thackeray's "supper party" thus rose to the dignity of "riot." Elwin, who feared that a man could not acquire very much law in the intervals between sprees, must have been perplexed when he received in the course of a few weeks a letter which asserted: "There are but two writers in our language who ever touch law without showing their ignorance on the subject. These are Shakespeare and Fielding. Walter Scott, a lawyer by profession and by office, is no exception."\* The author of this letter was M. Davenport Hill, the distinguished lawyer who reformed the criminal laws of Great Britain.

Hitherto nearly everyone, except Richardson and his friends, had admitted the high art of "Tom Jones." Even Watson and Mudford conceded so much as that. It remained for an anonymous contributor to "Blackwood's Magazine" in March, 1860, to annihilate every claim of Fielding's pre-eminence. When compared with Walter Scott or Jane Austen, Fielding was found to possess little imagination and no humour—unless "a bloody nose" or "the discovery of two persons breaking the seventh com-

\* Elwin, "Some XVIII Century Men of Letters," edited by his son, 1902, II, 100.

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

mandment" be sufficient to raise a laugh,—to be "utterly without seriousness," and "ludicrously incompetent to portray any of the deeper emotional and intellectual forms of life." "We must burn our pens, and abdicate the judgment-seat altogether," declared the anonymous gentleman, "if we are to pronounce him a great artist, or a great painter of human nature." And again: "The only point which admits of something like demonstration is that on which the critics have hitherto been most nearly unanimous—namely, the construction of 'Tom Jones'; and on this point we believe it may be said that we have *proved* them to be wrong." So Fielding was deprived of his last laurel. Thackeray, who read the article, rebuked the "wiseacre" and "hypocrite" in a Roundabout paper, and once more paid his "respect, and wonder, and admiration, to the brave old Master."\*

None of the mid-Victorians except Thackeray can be said to have taken Fielding as their master; nor was Fielding's direct influence on more than one other novelist of the period very apparent. In boyhood Dickens read "Tom Jones" and he must have read later "Amelia." In one of his letters, too, he referred to "a beautiful thought in Fielding's 'Journey from this World to the Next' where the baby he had lost many years before was found by him all radiant and happy, building him a bower in the Elysian Fields where they were to live together when he came."† "Amelia," a novel designed in part to expose crime and public vice, must be regarded as the forerunner of "Oliver Twist" and all those novels of criminal life which flourished in the nineteenth century; but the humour of Dickens and the numberless caricature portraits with which he enriched English literature are more akin to Smollett's work than to Fielding's. "Fielding," remarked M. Davenport Hill,

\* "Thorns in the Cushion" in "Roundabout Papers."

† "Letters of Charles Dickens," New York, 1879, I, 461-462.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“never runs into caricature, although he sometimes advances to its very edge, as in the lamentations of Parson Adams at the absence of his sermon on *Vanity*.” Bulwer-Lytton wrote handsomely of Fielding and relied upon him for disquisitions on the art of fiction; but the novel of real life such as Lytton wrote—“*The Caxtons*,” for instance—derives from Sterne rather than from Fielding. Poe the American, who probably never read Fielding, expressed contempt for him. In order to exalt Dickens at the expense of everybody else, he could say: “For one Dickens there are five million Smolletts, Fieldings, Marryatts, Arthurs, Cocktons, Bogtons, and Frogtons.”\* James Russell Lowell, I have heard, shocked Harriet Beecher Stowe by suggesting to the author of “*Uncle Tom’s Cabin*” that she might improve her art by reading “*Tom Jones*.”

On the other hand, the virile mind of George Eliot felt no repugnance towards Fielding; and she became a greater novelist by far than her American contemporary. To her Fielding was “a great historian” of human nature. Like him she divided “*Middlemarch*,” her most mature novel, into books sometimes imitating his famous initial chapters. Despite many differences, both George Eliot and Fielding clearly believed that the true analogy to the novel of real life was to be found in the Dutch masters. Fielding’s critics in his lifetime, when they wished to be particularly severe, called him nothing but a Dutch painter. The charge he met, so far as we know, in silence. George Eliot, for her supposed want of idealism, was also put into the same category. Her spirited reply was that she gloried in the comparison; that she was quite willing to leave the Madonnas, the angels, and the romanced villains to others while she herself pursued her humdrum way among quite ordinary people, distinguished neither for their virtue nor

\* Review of Lever’s “*Charles O’Malley*” in “*Graham’s Magazine*,” March, 1842.

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

for their crimes. Hers were the mixed characters of a Fielding.

Fielding's novels, it is perhaps needless to say, formed no part of the Brontë library. In a charming letter of advice to a friend during girlhood, Charlotte Brontë told her that all novels by the side of Scott's were "worthless"; that as for herself she read the poets and biographers mostly. "Omit," her injunction was, "the comedies of Shakespeare, and the 'Don Juan,' perhaps the 'Cain,' of Byron, though the latter is a magnificent poem, and read the rest fearlessly; that must indeed be a depraved mind which can gather evil from 'Henry VIII.,' from 'Richard III.,' from 'Macbeth,' and 'Hamlet,' and 'Julius Caesar.' Scott's sweet, wild romantic poetry can do you no harm." A young woman whose delicacy was disturbed by "As You Like It" or "The Merchant of Venice" could never have read far in "Tom Jones." Such knowledge as Miss Brontë possessed of Fielding came from Thackeray's lecture, which she heard when it was first given in London and which she afterwards read at leisure. Of her emotions she wrote: "I was present at the Fielding lecture: the hour spent in listening to it was a painful hour. That Thackeray was wrong in his way of treating Fielding's character and vices, my conscience told me. . . . Had Thackeray owned a son, grown, or growing up, and a son, brilliant but reckless—would he have spoken in that light way of courses that lead to disgrace and the grave? . . . Had I a brother yet living, I should tremble to let him read Thackeray's lecture on Fielding. I should hide it away from him."\* Three years before Miss Brontë heard the lecture, she lost her brother Branwell, who, long habituated to evil ways, had died at the age of thirty-one, a hopeless inebriate. So quite naturally all that Thackeray said of Field-

\* Elizabeth Gaskell, "Life of Charlotte Brontë," edited by Shorter, 1900, p. 610.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ing's youth reminded her of her brother's wild years which darkened and frightened the Brontë household. Thackeray, in his account of Fielding, had indeed described an inebriate and then lavished upon him excuses for the conduct of a "miserable, weak-minded rogue." Had Fielding been such a man, he, too, would have gone to the "piteous destruction" that lay in wait for Branwell Brontë; he would have travelled the road of Shakespeare's fellow playwrights—the road of Greene and Peele and Marlowe.

When a Charlotte Brontë could infer from the words of Thackeray, supposed to be the most favourable ever spoken of Fielding, that the author of "Tom Jones" was really an inebriate, the time had surely arrived for the trained investigator to give his attention to the details of that dissipated gentleman's career. The obvious reason why no competent biographer of Fielding had yet appeared was because few materials lay ready at hand. This was why Southey, the indefatigable biographer, left Fielding untouched. Neither he nor anyone else could find any large body of intimate correspondence, the biographer's boon, for there was none to find. Many contemporary references to Fielding were scattered through letters, memoirs, magazines, and newspapers; but to collect them, sort them, and make the proper use of them meant years of labor. The pioneer in this work was Frederick Lawrence, a barrister of the Middle Temple. For the three years preceding his admission to the bar in 1849, Lawrence held a position in the library of the British Museum, as one of the compilers of the general catalogue; and in this capacity he gained an extensive knowledge of miscellaneous books and pamphlets as shown by his many critical articles in the periodicals. To "Sharpe's London Magazine" he contributed those studies afterwards expanded into "The Life of Henry Fielding; with Notices of his Writings, his Times, and his Contemporaries" (1855), a volume of three hundred and

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

eighty pages. Lawrence went over Fielding's entire career, correcting Murphy and his successors in many places, and adding numerous hitherto unknown details; he sought to construct the proper social and literary background; and he gave an interesting account of Fielding's works so far as he knew them. If a number of publications escaped his notice, it should be remembered that the Fielding canon had not yet been established, and that Lawrence was the first to make any essential additions to it.

Lawrence's biography, however, was not a thoroughly good piece of work. His knowledge of "The Jacobite's Journal," which he called, following Scott, "The Jacobite Journal," was confined to the two leaders reprinted by Murphy and to such abstracts of the others as were given in "The Gentleman's Magazine." "We have not been lucky enough," he said, "to meet with any original copy of Fielding's paper." This ill luck on the part of a former cataloguer in the British Museum seems incredible; for the library of that institution then possessed a nearly complete file of the periodical, which it had acquired with the Burney collection of newspapers as far back as 1818. Within "The Jacobite's Journal," which Lawrence could have made no real effort to discover, lay concealed more new facts about Fielding than in all the scattered pamphlets which the biographer brought together. As in this instance, Lawrence was too prone to take his matter carelessly or at second-hand. By a curious blunder, for example, he identified Henry Fielding with Timothy Fielding, a third-rate comedian, who with a company of cheap actors used to amuse the town at the George Inn in Smithfield during the time of the Bartholomew Fair. This Timothy Fielding, who had a booth at Tottenham Court also, died on August 22, 1738, at his house, the Buffalo Head Tavern in Bloomsbury. He was the "Mr Fielding" whose name appears after Mr. Furnish, the upholsterer, in the original cast of

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

“The Miser.” There was no other connection between the playwright and the actor. But after the two men had been made one, Lawrence was able to draw a graphic picture of Henry Fielding designing entertainments for “holiday folks” and perhaps exhibiting himself to the rabble in the early days of his reckless poverty. Had Lawrence possessed any adequate conception of Henry Fielding’s personality he would never have fallen into so gross an error.

This brings us to the prime defect of the book. Diligent as Lawrence was in research, he lacked critical insight; and owing to a fixed prepossession that Fielding’s character had been correctly set forth by Murphy and Thackeray, he interpreted facts, whether old or new, mostly to substantiate, rarely to overthrow, his predecessors. From Fielding’s “chequered and wayward life,” he thought, “many instructive lessons” might be drawn by the reader; “since, at every stage of it, it will be seen how surely retributive sorrow and suffering follow in the track of misspent hours.” To give point to this moral lesson, the biographer felt justified not only in misrepresenting facts but in creating them within the realm of his own imagination. Out of Fielding’s playful epistle to Sir Robert Walpole, Lawrence could get: “Writing was a drudgery to which he only resorted when impelled by necessity. . . . Never was poet or playwright prouder of his debts, his garret, and careless expenditure.” Out of an equally playful satire on Fielding called “Seasonable Reproof,” he could get: “A strange alternation, therefore, of light and shade did these early years of Fielding’s life present. To-day, familiar with the sordid haunts of poverty; to-morrow, gay in velvet, ruffles, and embroidery. Now, dining at the tables of the great, and quaffing champagne in ducal banquet-halls; and now seeking out the cheapest ordinary; or, if dinner were impossible, solacing himself with a pipe of tobacco.” And again, with the same disregard of fact, he could write of Fielding after the ap-

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

pearance of “*The Miser*”: “He was as yet, be it observed, not six-and-twenty, and the life of dissipation into which he had plunged left him little time or inclination for study, reflection, or mental improvement. Happy indeed would it have been for him had it been otherwise.” Within the space of four years this dissipated young man had really found time to write no less than fifteen plays, several of which had met with immense success. No English playwright, however sober, had ever shown greater industry.

In these misrepresentations the first Mrs. Fielding shared with her husband. Richardson’s statement that she was of illegitimate birth, Lawrence partially confirmed, he thought, by the discovery that her maiden name—Cradock or Craddock—sometimes appears in the genealogies as Braddock and Brawicke, just as might be expected of a natural child whose parentage was uncertain. Had he not already settled the question in his own mind, he would have seen that Braddock and Brawicke were merely the errors of a scribe or a compositor; he certainly would never have gone on to infer that Mrs. Fielding, perhaps inheriting the weakness of her mother, was “a fond and foolish” woman who began her married life by abetting her husband in the follies which he was supposed to have committed at East Stour. “Poor girl! her fortune was soon dissipated to the winds; run away with by horses and hounds; lavished on yellow plush inexpressibles for idle funkeys; banqueted on by foolish squires, or consumed by other senseless extravagances.” As a result of this marriage, Fielding’s conduct, we see, did not improve much. Though he was faithful to his wife, he came in course of time to treat her with neglect. “His business and pursuits,” Lawrence imagined, “carried him much abroad. When he was absent on circuit and sessions, she was frequently left for days alone with her maid in their humble London lodgings; nay, it is to be feared that in the season of their bitterest penury she had often in

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

such companionship worn away the weary hours whilst he was the inmate of the prison or sponging-house."

Her death first awakened him to his senses. Though he had never been harsh or cruel to her in word or thought, he had been so "practically in act and deed," for he had brought upon her as well as upon himself misery and misfortune which common prudence might have averted. To put Lawrence's phrases all together, Fielding became, in the years subsequent to his wife's death, the prey of "remorse," "self-accusation," and "self-reproach"; and in atonement for his selfishness and duties left unperformed, he afterwards immortalized all her virtues in *Amelia*. Thus closed the story of "retributive sorrow." Unable to present a summary of Fielding's "merits and defects as a writer and a man," Lawrence subjoined in its stead a paragraph from Thackeray's lecture and described in imaginary scenes the reflections of Lyttelton and Hogarth and Garrick when they heard that "the stormy life" of their friend was at an end. Lyttelton mused over the happy boy whom he had known at Eton, "the roistering host" of later years, "the briefless barrister," and the "remorseful inmate" of the sponging-house who received aid from him "for the sake of weeping wife at home."

Lawrence's book was subjected to a thoroughly critical examination by Thomas Keightley, the author of "Fairy Mythology" and a "History of England" much read in his day. Though not a great man, Keightley had the historical sense and he was not inclined to take statements at second-hand without verification. It is clear that he had read Fielding's major works very closely, perhaps with a view to a biography—a project in which he was forestalled by Lawrence. His strictures on Lawrence, entitled "On the Life and Writings of Henry Fielding," were published in "Fraser's Magazine" for January and February, 1858. To these two articles he added a postscript in the June

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

number of this magazine and later gave in "Notes and Queries" some further results of his investigations. Keightley corrected his predecessor in several important particulars and made a few brilliant discoveries of his own; but the real significance of his work lay in his interpretation of the facts collected by Lawrence in their relation to the traditional Fielding. These facts Lawrence employed, as we have seen, to confirm all the errors of the tradition; Keightley employed them to expose the absurdities lurking in the old stories. Of Lawrence, Keightley said justly: "He fails to make the due use of his materials; he does not always see what was, as it were, before his eyes, he fails to draw inferences, or draws erroneous ones. . . . My object, then, is to do what he has left undone; from his materials and references to make correct statements, and deduce just, or at least probable, conclusions, and if possible to represent Henry Fielding as he really was."

Keightley was the first to cast doubt on the Fielding pedigree, which has since been proved to be, as he anticipated, a mere forgery, and on the story of a fortune dissipated at East Stour, which has likewise been shown to be utterly false. A rough estimate which he made of Fielding's probable income from his plays should have put to rest forever the tales of the young dramatist's abject poverty and the anecdotes of his sponging upon his friends for a dinner. He set in their correct light the remarks of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu about Fielding's improvidence and the report which Horace Walpole circulated of Fielding's debased associates while a justice of the peace. On the latter count, he had but to give the names of the principal persons whom Fielding was entertaining at his table when Rigby broke in upon the magistrate. "There is nothing," he added, "in his own works or in Murphy's which might lead us to suppose that at this or any other period of his life he kept low company; there is no know-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ledge shown by him of the language and habits of the lower classes that a gentleman might not have obtained without descending from his position.” “*Jonathan Wild*,” which had often been cited as evidence of Fielding’s depraved tastes, Keightley rightly described as a scathing political satire aimed specifically at Sir Robert Walpole. Against “the malicious assertion” of Richardson, repeated by Lawrence, that the first Mrs. Fielding was illegitimate, he set the tradition of Salisbury that she belonged to a “highly respectable” family and the praise lavished by all who knew her upon her character. Lawrence’s cruel insinuation that Fielding neglected this charming woman and was perhaps unfaithful to her, he treated with the contempt it deserved. “*Amelia*,” far from breaking Fielding’s heart while he composed it, as a reviewer of Lawrence had surmised, Keightley averred must have been written in a mood where no remorse was, where love and admiration for remembered worth and beauty predominated over all other emotions. Though Keightley accepted the tradition of Fielding’s dissipation in youth, he gave him a clean score on all other counts. Similarly he vindicated Tom Jones against all the vices that had been fabricated against this boy. If vice be a habit, as the moralists say, Keightley could discern none in Tom. “He did not drink, swear, lie, cheat, game, oppress, malign, &c.” This is doubtless an overstatement; but Tom had none of the deep-seated vices; his sins of the flesh were of the kind that Dante punished in the first circles of the Inferno. They did not penetrate and vitiate the character of the young gentleman.

Keightley’s sane observations, hidden away in a magazine, had little or no immediate effect upon the Fielding tradition as fixed by Lawrence and Thackeray. To most writers on Fielding during the next quarter-century Keightley’s articles were unknown; and by the few who knew of them, they were underrated or ignored. Again and

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

again the old dissipated profligate was tricked out anew by critics and reviewers—by William Forsyth, for example, in “*The Novels and Novelists of the Eighteenth Century*” (1871), and by J. Heneage Jesse in “*Memoirs of Celebrated Etonians*” (1875), where we read: “Never, perhaps, has there existed a sadder example of a man of illustrious talents, and at the same time of an illustrious descent, being reduced by his own indiscretions to so grievous a condition of indigence and privation as fell to the lot of the once gay and gallant Henry Fielding.” Among the casual biographers, Dr. James P. Browne was an exception to the rule. Familiar with the major and many of the minor works of Fielding, he read the author through these works rather than through anecdotes and hearsay. Browne, however, was not a man of letters; his style was laboured and feeble; and beyond this, all that he said in the preface to his edition of Fielding in 1871 was a good deal vitiated by his reprint of Murphy’s “able and critical essay,” which readers surely found more interesting than the physician’s protest against Thackeray’s unfair treatment of Fielding and Tom Jones, and his contention that the main effort of Fielding, in all his works, was “to instil into the soul of man the necessity of using graceful truthfulness and benevolent urbanity of manner in social intercourse, with detestation of all hypocritical dealing.”

Fielding’s moral measure was also soberly taken by Leslie Stephen, Thackeray’s son-in-law. In distinction from Richardson, “a straitlaced parson out of the pulpit,” Stephen described Fielding as a liberal Churchman whose moral and religious ideas were in agreement with those of Benjamin Hoadly, the latitudinarian Bishop of Salisbury and Winchester, whom the author of “*Tom Jones*” reckoned among his friends. In his “*English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*” (1876), Stephen wrote:

“The ideal man of Fielding’s novels is as far from being

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

a libertine as from being an ascetic. He is a full-blooded healthy animal, but respects the Church, so long as the Church does not break with common sense. Parson Adams—probably his finest conception—drinks beer and smokes pipes, and when necessity compels, takes to the cudgels with a vigour which might have excited the envy of Christopher North. He scorns the unborn Malthus, and is outrageously impecunious in his habits. He is entirely free from worldliness, and is innocent as a child in the arts of flattery and time-serving. But it is not because he is an enthusiast after the fashion of Whitefield, or has any high-flown views of the sacerdotal office. Common sense is the rule of his life, or, in other words, the views which commend themselves to a man who sees the world as it is, who has no visionary dreams, and who has a thoroughly generous nature. Fielding would have Christianity freed from all extravagances—that is to say, from those vivid imaginings which subordinate the world of sense to the supernatural; he thinks that a man should be a gentleman, but laughs heartily at the extravagances of the fire-eating descendants of the old romantic cavaliers; he is for a stringent enforcement of the moral laws, which actually keep society together, but has no patience with those who would attempt any radical reform, or draw the line higher than ordinary human nature can endure. Richardson is more of a sentimentalist; De Foe is simply commonplace; and Smollett content to observe the eccentricities of his race without preaching about them. Fielding, though hardly an exalted moralist, expresses the genuine sentiment of his time with a force and fulness which make his works more impressive than the whole body of contemporary sermons, because untrammelled by conventional necessities."

And again with reference to the breadth and sincerity of Fielding's art:

"Fielding announced that his object is to give a faithful

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

picture of human nature. Human nature includes many faculties which had an imperfect play under the conditions of the time; there were dark sides to it, of which, with all his insight, he had but little experience; and heroic impulses, which he was too much inclined to treat as follies. But the more solid constituents of that queer compound, as they presented themselves under the conditions of the time, were never more clearly revealed to any observer. A complete criticism of the English artistic literature of the eighteenth century would place Fielding at the centre, and measure the completeness of other representatives pretty much as they recede from or approach to his work. Others, as Addison and Goldsmith, may show finer qualities of workmanship and more delicate sentiment; but Fielding, more than anyone, gives the essential—the very form and pressure of the time.”\*

These views Stephen repeated, using other words, in an essay on Fielding’s novels included in the third series of “Hours in a Library” (1879). Neither before nor since has anyone else ever drawn so complete a portrait of Fielding the preacher, who became, under Stephen’s hands, perilously near to being, what he was not, a pedlar of moral maxims.

At the time Leslie Stephen thus dwelt upon Fielding’s honest art and homespun morality, he gave slight credence to the account of Fielding’s life as related by the biographers. “To describe him,” he then said, “as a mere reckless Bohemian, is to overlook the main facts of his story. He was manly to the last, not in the sense in which man means animal; but with the manliness of one who struggles bravely to redeem early errors, and who knows the value of independence, purity, and domestic affection. The scanty anecdotes which do duty for his biography reveal little of

\* “English Thought in the Eighteenth Century,” New York, 1876, II, 378-380.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

his true life. . . . Really to know the man, we must go to his books." One may wish that Stephen had never been given an opportunity to reverse this sane opinion by writing a biographical introduction to that edition of Fielding's works which appeared in 1882 under his name. For the undertaking Stephen made no independent research whatever; he merely took and related as probable fact what he had before condemned as more or less apocryphal. He accepted not only most of Murphy's anecdotes but also, so far as he knew them, the old slanders of Fielding's political enemies which Murphy had expressly declared to be unfounded. Moreover, from Murphy's silence concerning many things which we should like to know, he concluded that "there were probably some points in Fielding's history which neither he nor any one else would have regarded as altogether edifying." Indeed, no one during Fielding's life, said Stephen, took the trouble "even to draw his picture." It should be, therefore, no cause for regret that the greater part of Fielding's career is covered by oblivion; for "we know as much of him as is necessary to explain his work"; and these familiar outlines "anyone may fill up more minutely by such colouring as pleases his fancy."

By relying upon fancy rather than fact, Stephen fell into many difficulties and contradictions. Nor did that common sense for which he had praised Fielding come to his rescue so often as it ought. Such anecdotes as still wore for him a suspicious look he retold in a manner having a greater resemblance to truth. This could be done by clipping off or adding words and phrases. The "yellow liveries," for example, in the East Stour story, he distrusted and subsequently brought forward evidence to show, as I have related elsewhere, that they belonged to a namesake, not to Henry Fielding at all. Accordingly, he then removed this detail, remarking, as he did so, that the rest of the account of how Fielding consumed a fortune in the country was

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

probably true. The natural inference should have been that the whole story was probably false. Again, it was hard for Stephen to reconcile the tradition, which he believed, that Fielding wrote merely for money, regardless of public approval, with the fact that his works show fewer traces of haste than one would expect to find in books composed under the pressure of poverty. His conclusion was that the novels were written with care when the author enjoyed leisure; while the plays, about which the critic knew less, "were poured out at full speed" under the inspiration of wine and tobacco. The bottle and the tobacco were too often at hand. Likewise, after having taken it for granted that Fielding associated in his younger days with people of the kind described in some of the plays and in "*Jonathan Wild*," men and women who broke all the laws of society, the biographer was confronted with the fact that Fielding, as appears from his criminal pamphlets, was later "shocked and disgusted by the revelations brought before him" as a justice of the peace. Oblivious of the contradiction, Stephen remarked thereon that hitherto Fielding "had been familiar with a higher social stratum." It was clear to Stephen that Fielding had read at some time, in spite of dissipation, many good books and few if any bad ones; nevertheless he was not learned nor did he really possess that knowledge of literature and law which he was fond of displaying. "No one will doubt," he said after perusing the poems, "that Fielding loved '*Celia*' seriously and even passionately," "though it is . . . stated that she was illegitimate" and "we can hardly deny that he probably permitted himself some questionable distractions for which he afterwards did penance by writing '*Amelia*.'" In this fluent manner, alloying fact with fancy, Stephen went on to the end as if he had no more concern for his own reputation than for Fielding's.

There were times when Stephen let his fancy run still  
243

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

wilder. Certain that Fielding could not have obtained from his plays an income sufficient to have supported him in “the reckless indulgence” of youth, the biographer had to look elsewhere for an inexhaustible supply; and he found it in the most unlikely place in the world—in “the bounty of Lady Mary.” Lady Mary Wortley Montagu did, indeed, help Fielding bring out his first comedy and she accepted the dedication of another; but she was not noted for generosity to her poor relations, nor did anyone before Stephen ever hint that she opened her purse at the cry of her cousin. When dying, Fielding like all men, caught at straws and tried various questionable remedies. Stephen, anxious to represent him as a prey to quack doctors throughout life, surmised that the dedication of “The Mock Doctor” in the full health of youth to Dr. John Misaubin might not be, as generally supposed, ironical, but down-right serious. The truth is, not only that the dedication is a piece of perfect irony but that the doctor in the play itself is a burlesque of Misaubin—of his speech, his mannerisms, and his pill.

It was admitted that “poor Fielding,” after a youth wasted in oscillating between taverns and the charity of his friends, tried hard to do something as a justice of the peace; that in the last months of 1753 he did actually, as he took pride in declaring, free London of robbery and murder; but to accomplish his purpose “he had to employ very dirty tools.” The persons whom Fielding really employed, if his word is worth anything, were special constables, “all men of known and approved fidelity and intrepidity,” into whose hands a notorious gang of ruffians was betrayed by a man whom we should now describe as a detective though he was then called a thief-taker. It was these men, all chosen from householders, whom Stephen described as “very dirty tools.” Fielding, as I have already told the story, organized them into a most efficient

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

body of police. This was his great work as a practical reformer from which Leslie Stephen removed the lustre.

Nor did the biographer stop here. In the underworld of London there still flourished a set of wretches who made it a business to induce simple people to commit crimes in order to inform against them and obtain the rewards offered by the Government. Of these informers, Jonathan Wild had been in his day an illustrious example. That the courts of justice might be rid of so disgraceful a traffic, Fielding advised that the practice of advertising rewards for the detection of crime be discontinued; and from funds supplied by the Privy Council he formed his body of constables and detectives to the discouragement of professional informers, who of course died hard. One of these miserable survivors, named MacDaniel, "falsely accused one Kidden," says Stephen, "of highway robbery, and procured his conviction and execution for the sake of the reward offered." The real facts afterwards came out; and MacDaniel was convicted of his crime and transported. By a wild flight of fancy, Stephen conjectured that MacDaniel was the man whom Fielding engaged in the early winter of 1753 to trap the gang of street robbers which was then terrorizing the town. The reason for Stephen's suspicion was the coincidence between the name of the informer and the maiden name of Fielding's second wife, both being, he said, MacDaniel. "Were I writing," he concluded, "a life of Shakespeare, I might base something more than a conjecture upon such a fact. As it is, I will only say, that possibly Fielding may have been giving employment to some of his wife's poor relations." By this backhanded stroke, Stephen derived the mother of many children from the dregs of London. The fact is, Henry Fielding never made, his brother John positively asserted, any use of MacDaniel whatever;\* nor could the case of that villain have ever come before him

\* "A Plan for Preventing Robberies," 1755, pp. 4-6.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

in any of its stages. When MacDaniel informed against Kidden, Fielding had resigned from the Bow Street court; and when MacDaniel himself was convicted, Fielding was dead. The maiden name of the second Mrs. Fielding was not MacDaniel; it was Daniel. The two names imply descent as far removed from each other as Edinburgh and London.

It is unnecessary to seek for any hidden motive to explain Stephen's outrageous performance. A journalist and editor by training, Stephen never acquired much aptitude for independent research despite his sustained work on the "Dictionary of National Biography." His talent lay in collecting and restating what had been said by others; that is, his sources of information were nearly always secondary. If his account of Fielding is the worst biographical sketch that he ever wrote, it is partly because his sources were untrustworthy and partly because he fell into the style and manner of his predecessors who felt that anything said in one sentence to the credit of Fielding must be withdrawn not later than the next. "Ever let the fancy roam" might have been taken as the motto of most writers on Fielding with the exception of Keightley. Few of them have given evidence of possessing that kind of judgment which the world describes as common sense. Many of them, when they touched upon Fielding, appear to have lost their minds completely. But when they cast aside the mirror of apocryphal anecdotes, they have sometimes seen Fielding in his works as he was. After reading "A Voyage to Lisbon," where Fielding speaks in his own person, Stephen remarked that the book "makes us love and respect the writer." And again: "If a good heart may show itself, even in a dying man, in indomitable buoyancy of spirit, keen and kindly interest in the living beings who share his fate, and warm gratitude for every attention which he receives, we may safely say that Fielding stands the test admirably."

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

Leslie Stephen was the last of the brilliant defamers of Fielding. Others, it is true, have since repeated the old slanders in the old style; but they are all ill-informed writers without standing in the republic of letters. When, for example, one Emanuel Green\* tells us that Fielding was "a most despicable character," that his works, although much talked about, have been "but little read," and that "the world has hardly derived either profit or benefit from them," we set it down to ignorance. The man, above all others, to whom the world is indebted for a more just view of Fielding is Austin Dobson, who contributed in 1883 a monograph on Fielding to the English Men of Letters series. Though Dobson mainly depended upon Lawrence for the outline of his story, he re-examined his predecessor's sources of information, subjected them to a critical test which often resulted in a new interpretation, and added on his own account a considerable body of fresh facts. Towards the old tales about Fielding he took, though with less pungency, Keightley's attitude of distrust, pointing out their impossible or incongruous details and leaving it to the reader to accept or reject the rest. Instead of fancy, common sense was his guide.

Dobson's book received the highest approbation in the world of letters, which had been perplexed for more than a century by the utter disagreement between the Fielding whom one sees in the novels and the Fielding whom the biographers depicted. If the reconciliation was still far from complete, a serious endeavour at least was here made to reach one; and more light was ahead. In the years following, some inaccuracies were corrected, some obscurities were cleared up, and several new details of Fielding's career were uncovered by scholars who corresponded with Dobson directly or sent their contributions to "Notes and Queries." The alterations thus made necessary were in-

\* "Henry Fielding and his Works," London, 1909.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

corporated by Dobson in later editions of his volume. When the edition of 1900 appeared with several appendices, it was the opinion of a most competent judge that "probably no better thing than this will be done for Fielding." Dobson's elucidation of Fielding's career, however, did not end with the last edition of his book. His essays on Fielding which have since appeared possess very great interest. In "The National Review" for August, 1911, he gave, for example, an account of two newly discovered letters of Fielding, publishing one of them entire. These letters to John Fielding, filled with personal incidents, are among the last that the novelist ever wrote. It so happens, too, that the most important of Dobson's earlier discoveries never found full entrance into his biography of Fielding. I refer to the description of Fielding's library, based upon the auctioneer's catalogue. This essay, which was first presented to the public in "Bibliographia"\*\* for 1895, gave the last touch of absurdity to the opinion of Leslie Stephen and numberless others that Fielding tried to display in his novels and pamphlets an intimate acquaintance with books about which he probably had little knowledge at first hand.

The results of Dobson's studies have stimulated a number of investigators to go much further than he went into the details of Fielding's literary life. Frederick S. Dickson, for instance, reprinted in 1907 with critical annotations Keightley's essays on Fielding which had originally appeared in "Fraser's Magazine," and contributed to "The North American Review" for April, 1913, a paper on Thackeray and Fielding which settled several old questions in dispute on Fielding's character. Unfortunately Mr. Dickson has been chary of publication. No one who has not carefully inspected the Fielding Collection which he

\* "Bibliographica," London, 1895, Vol. I, Pt. II, pp. 163-173. Reprinted in "Eighteenth Century Vignettes," third series, London, 1896, pp. 164-178. Reduced to a short paragraph in *Henry Fielding*, 1900, pp. 275-276.

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

gave to the Library of Yale University can form any just idea of the scope of this scholar's work. Professor John Edwin Wells, taking a hint from Keightley, has worked out in detail Fielding's political purpose in "Jonathan Wild" and thereby set right the relation of that book to Fielding's personal career and his attitude of persistent hostility towards the policies of Sir Robert Walpole. Dr. Gerard E. Jensen has closely studied the controversies in which Fielding was engaged while writing "The Covent-Garden Journal," and has thus given the world the first authentic account it has ever had of Fielding the editor. Miss G. M. Godden, as the result of explorations among the manuscripts of the British Museum and the Public Record Office, has brought to light official letters which Fielding wrote while a justice of the peace and, surpassing all else in interest and importance, some of the documents in the Chancery Case involving Fielding, his brother, and sisters. These documents and most of the others concerning the case were later uncovered by Mr. F. J. Pope, who was unaware that he had been anticipated by Miss Godden. This old Chancery suit has necessitated the entire reconstruction of the story of Fielding's boyhood and youth. Perhaps the most highly trained investigator that has yet given his attention to Fielding is Mr. J. Paul de Castro, under whose hand the traditional anecdotes about Fielding are being fast overthrown by positive evidence against them.\*

Literary criticism has not always kept even pace with discovery. It has been difficult for writers on Fielding to throw off the incubus of Arthur Murphy. Dobson never

\* See Dickson, "The Life and Writings of Fielding," Cleveland, The Rowfant Club, 1907; Wells, "Publications of the Modern Language Association," March, 1913; Jensen, "The Covent-Garden Journal," New Haven, 1915; Miss Godden, "Henry Fielding," London, 1910; Pope, "The British Archivist," Jan., 1914; and Mr. J. Paul de Castro, "Notes and Queries" for 1914-1917.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

had perfect faith in his own convictions. Though he scored Murphy for "inaccuracies," for "graphic tags and flourishes," he conceded, as recently as 1912, that Murphy's "general estimate" was "well-enough."\* The calumniators had arrived at their gross portraits of Fielding by exaggerating his features as they saw them in Murphy. Dobson's method was to tone down what Murphy said and to alter or suppress here and there a line that disfigured Fielding's character. The outcome was a rather pale and lifeless personality quite in harmony with the ultra-refinement and sense of propriety which dominated English literature when Dobson's biography of Fielding first appeared. The reader of that book feels, when Dobson approaches the character of Fielding, that something is being withheld, that he is not being told all, and he becomes irritated by an air of mystery where in fact there is nothing that needs be concealed. A few years ago the world was again grateful to Dobson for large extracts from the long letter which Fielding sent from Lisbon to his brother John, but everybody wondered why more of the letter was not published. All Fielding ever asked of those who wrote about him was that they should tell the truth.

An idea running through Dobson's work, though never quite distinctly expressed, is that Fielding was endowed with "a curious dual individuality." The reader is led to surmise that if he knew all there would emerge a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, except that the differences between the two personalities would be less pronounced than in Stevenson's romance. Murphy and his followers, he half concludes, portrayed the Mr. Hyde; whereas Dobson would give us the Dr. Jekyll or the man's prevailing personality. That we all possess a better and a worse self, that sometimes the one and sometimes the other is in the ascendant, was discovered by the Greek philosophers; and

\* "A New Dialogue of the Dead," in "The National Review," Dec., 1912.

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

no one who has dealt long with mankind will be disposed to question the assertion. · But that Fielding's two self-hoods, so to speak, were more strongly marked than in other men of sensitive natures who have fought their way through life, is a doubtful assumption. To explain him in this way is to resort to a crude psychology. Fielding was merely human like the rest of us.

James Russell Lowell was the first to say just this. A few months after the publication of Dobson's biography, Lowell gave the address\* when Miss Margaret Thomas's bust of Fielding was unveiled in the Shire-Hall at Taunton. There had been some objection on both sides of the Atlantic to this proposed "tribute of respect and affection" to the author of "Tom Jones." In allusion to the criticism, Lowell spoke out boldly for "a great and original genius who has done honour to his country," whose "character is gradually clearing itself of the stains with which malice or jealousy or careless hearsay had darkened it." Against the stories told to Fielding's discredit, he set the evidence of his writings, "that he had habits of study and industry that are not to be put on at will as one puts on his overcoat, and that are altogether inconsistent with the dissolute life he is supposed to have led." "We may read," he declared in closing, "Fielding's character clearly in his books, for it was not complex, but especially in his 'Voyage to Lisbon,' where he reveals it in artless inadvertence. He was a lovingly thoughtful husband, a tender father, a good brother, a useful and sagacious magistrate. He was courageous, gentle, thoroughly conscious of his own dignity as a gentleman, and able to make that dignity respected. If we seek for a single characteristic which more than any other would sum him up, we should say that it was his absolute manliness, a manliness in its type English from

\* Sept. 4, 1883. Reprinted in "Democracy and Other Addresses," Boston, 1887.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

top to toe." And of Fielding's art, Lowell wrote for the inscription beneath the bust:

He looked on naked nature unashamed,  
And saw the Sphinx, now bestial, now divine,  
In change and rechange; he nor praised nor blamed,  
But drew her as he saw with fearless line.

This was a different Fielding from the one Dobson drew. Presumably, we are told, he had his "failings and lapses," for he was a man; but the courageous life he lived stands in no need of an apology. His character, far from being "complex," was so simple and straightforward that no one should mistake it who knows his works. Lowell set the clock to the new time.

The public was not prepared for Lowell's address. Readers were surprised at its tone, and in some cases loudly protested against its unqualified praise of Fielding's character—of the bibulous man who, they supposed, had written his books in the early mornings after nights spent in taverns, who bilked landladies, who bore down on friends for a guinea, who kept loose company, and left his wife and children to thrive as they might. Lowell's sincere and pre-meditated words were attributed to a desire to say nothing that should offend the admirers of Fielding who had honoured him with a bust. The occasion on which the words were spoken was held to be the only excuse for them. Lowell replied by republishing his address; and his friend Professor Lounsbury, without exactly taking sides in the controversy, declared that the time had come to reprint, for the light they would throw upon the questions at issue, those works of Fielding which his biographers underestimated or despised because they had never read them.\*

But without this aid enlightened public opinion was soon disposed to welcome the new Fielding in place of that

\* "The Century Magazine," Feb., 1884, XXVII, 634-636.

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

artistic creation which came from the brain of Thackeray. It was perhaps a little hard for Leslie Stephen, when he wrote in 1889 his account of Fielding for the "Dictionary of National Biography," to revise and repudiate statements which he had made earlier; but he acquitted himself with little apparent reluctance, though he was still uncertain whether the maiden name of the second Mrs. Fielding might not be MacDaniel or Macdonald after all, despite the fact that Dobson had produced the entry in the parish register showing it to be Daniel. Professor Saintsbury also has several times written admirably of Fielding, only once, I think, lapsing into the old manner of the discredited biographers; and Edmund Gosse and Andrew Lang have more casually stated the case for Fielding. Likewise Sir Walter Raleigh, treating with contempt the sentimental apologists, has dwelt upon Fielding's "splendid candour, his magnanimity, his tolerance," and his merciless attitude towards all kinds of meanness. And the late Samuel Butler, though sometimes fatigued by Fielding's "prolix" episodes, thought the author of "Tom Jones" must have been a delightful companion, and placed the great book above Job, the Psalms, and the Prophets. What these and other men have said, sometimes with eloquence, has helped immensely to establish Fielding, the man, in popular esteem.

The last great word for Fielding was spoken by the late W. E. Henley. He spoke twice—briefly in "Views and Reviews"\*\* (1890) and at large in "An Essay on the Life, Genius and Achievement of the Author" prefixed to a volume of "The Complete Works of Henry Fielding, Esq." (1903). Making no claim to research, Henley took the so-called facts of Fielding's life and drew his own independent inferences from them. Indeed, he was rather inclined to underrate our knowledge of Fielding's career,

\* Reprinted from a review of Dobson's Book in "The Athenaeum," April 28, 1883.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

remarking as he went along that “nobody knows” what everybody knew who had carefully read Dobson. In his longer essay he relied mainly upon Saintsbury, nor in his restatements did he pay much attention to exactness. Moreover, his acquaintance with Fielding’s works scarcely extended beyond the four novels, “*A Voyage to Lisbon*,” and some of the plays. All this should be understood by readers who take up the most brilliant essay on Fielding that has ever been written. Henley’s knowledge, however, was from the very first quite sufficient to make him see that the biographers before Dobson “somehow or other contrived to misapprehend and misapply” the plainest facts of Fielding’s life; that they preferred to the evidence of their own senses “the foolish fancies” of Murphy, “the brilliant antitheses” of Lady Mary, and the malicious remarks of Richardson, Smollett, and Horace Walpole. Everywhere he found a “perversion of life, and character, and fact”; but most of all in Thackeray, who, “whether wilfully or stupidly, misunderstood and mis-stated the Man,” though he was “in absolute sympathy with the Writer.” Dobson’s biography he thought “a brave book,” though he lamented its apologetic tone and the mid-Victorian mood of the author when he wrote of “this great man apart from his works.” Against the defamers and the apologists, Henley set his own Fielding. In more eloquent words than Lowell’s, he concluded:

“Here is a man brave, generous, kind to the *n*th degree; a man with a great hatred of meanness and hypocrisy, and a strong regard for all forms of *virtus*, whether natural and impulsive or an effect of culture and reflection; an impassioned lover, a devout husband, a most cordial and careful father; so staunch a friend that his books are so many proofs of his capacity for friendship; of so sound a heart, of so vigorous a temperament, of so clear-eyed and serene a spirit, that years and calamities and disease do not exist

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

for him, and he takes his leave of the World in one of the most valiant and most genial little books that ever was penned; distinguished among talkers by a delightful gaiety, a fine and gracious understanding, an inalienable dignity; withal of an intelligence at once so vigilant and so penetrating, at once so observant and so laborious and exacting, that, without hurry as without noise, patient ever and ever diligent, a master of life, a master of character, a master of style, he achieved for us the four great books we have, and, in achieving them, did so nobly by his nation and his mother tongue that he that would praise our splendid, all-comprehending speech aright has said the best he can of it when he says that it is the speech of Shakespeare and Fielding."

In these resonant phrases Henley permits no jarring discord. There is no reference to "follies" such as the English parson felt constrained to put into the inscription on Fielding's tomb in far-away Lisbon; there is no face, as Thackeray would have it, worn by dissipation; there are no claret stains; there is no wet towel. The twenty sane years from Dobson to Henley removed from Fielding the old marks of a penitent rake, and left undimmed the lustre of all those rare qualities of head and heart which Thackeray and the parson really saw and set forth with almost equal eloquence. On these prime characteristics of Fielding time and change can make no impression, for they are embedded in his works.

Still, eulogy is not biography. Despite strains of just and perfect eloquence, it is to be regretted that Henley did not, on the whole, better inform himself concerning those facts of Fielding's career which Dobson had reduced, to use Lowell's phrase, "from chaos to coherence by ridding it of fable." Really Henley did just what he accused the incompetent biographers of doing, only he did it in his own way in defiance of theirs. Like them he applied to Field-

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

ing's own life such incidents from the plays and novels as he wished—by hint and suggestion, or by positive assertion. In his heart he disbelieved the fables and malicious tales, some of which he ridiculed, but he did not hesitate to employ any one of them if it aided him to a brilliant or picturesque phrase. He denounced "the chaste and elegant Mr. Richardson" for the slur cast upon the birth of Charlotte Cradock; and immediately gave as his opinion that it makes no difference whether she was "a bastard or not," for she was a woman no less amiable than beautiful; she was the girl whom Harry Fielding "had married; loved to distraction; honoured with motherhood; spree'd with; starved with; betrayed (it may be; I know not); and seen die." As here Henley placed fact and slander on the same footing whenever such a course contributed to the vivacity of his style.

At times he not only accepted the very worst that had ever been said of Fielding, but defended and praised his conduct. The moral crux of "Tom Jones" has always been the young man's relations with Lady Bellaston. Remove that woman or use her to ennable instead of to degrade Tom, and then the novel may be read with profit by boys and girls. This has been the honest opinion of many critics and moralists; but the assertion that Fielding himself had ever accepted money, "for value received," from a Lady Bellaston, though it has been often repeated, originated with his most scurrilous enemies. Whether what they said was true or false did not concern them. They were engaged in a warfare to the bitter end. With these Grub Street writers, Henley unawares aligned himself. He even went further than they, for with Lady Bellaston he coupled Miss Matthews and "this lady or that," whom he surmised were a source of revenue to Fielding in the days when he received little from his plays. "I no more doubt," wrote Henley, "that the Matthews and Bellaston episodes were

## LATER BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS

profitable to Fielding: profitable and deemed in no sort reprehensible: than I doubt that their author wrote the 'Journal of A Voyage to Lisbon,' every sentence in which is stamped the utterance of a humane, stately and honourable gentleman."

Henley's procedure here and elsewhere was a sort of reversal of the one followed by the old calumniators. They converted Fielding's virtues into vices, and then denounced them. Henley converted the vices or follies attributed to Fielding by his enemies into virtues, and then set the seal of his approval upon them. His performance is so startling as to leave one breathless; but the judicious reader, after the recovery of his poise, is aware that the materials which Henley skilfully manipulated might be turned no less perversely to another issue. As much as the Watsons and Mudfords, Henley displayed himself at the expense of Fielding. These men wished to impress the public with their own moral superiority; Henley wished to shock middle-class respectability. He doubtless performed an excellent service; but he had no business to use as his weapon against Philistinism an imaginary account of young Harry Fielding's career, based upon old slanders eked out with conjectures.

## CHAPTER XXXVI

### FIELDING AS HE WAS

No biographer can leave Fielding where Henley left him. At all points the brilliant essayist needs revision and correction.

Fielding's youth, judged from the standpoint of the sober citizen, was indeed wild; but that word has a connotation inapplicable to him, and at best leaves the story but half told. He was a large boy of perfect health and handsome face. He grew up in the country with the ideals and habits of the squirearchy, on which were superimposed the habits and ideals of the aristocracy. In his descent from an Earl of Denbigh the young man took pride and believed, as he became older, that it should shield him against promiscuous slander from those beneath him. He was a gentleman who should enjoy the liberties accorded to gentlemen. This insistence upon the privileges of birth is seen in the first escapade of youth recorded of him, in all his controversies with Grub Street, in his later pamphlets for decreasing crime and improving the condition of the poor, in his journal and everywhere else when he speaks in his own person. Call it if you like class prejudice, for in a sense that is what it was, and it made him over-sensitive to criticism. But class prejudice with Fielding had its conspicuous limitations; it resulted in no aloofness from people, however low their rank, provided they possessed the personal qualities he admired, or amused him by their absurdities. When his friend James Harris remarked that he led an "irregular life," the phrase was intended to say, as is clear from the context, that he associated with all sorts and conditions of

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

men and women from the aristocracy down to the trades-people in the Strand and the “blue stockings with red clocks” of Covent Garden. The follies of each rank, he observed more than once, illustrated the follies of all the rest. No writer in our literature, Shakespeare not excepted, ever took a more intense delight in knowing all of life to its very dregs. For breaking the barriers of convention Shakespeare and Fielding were equally wild and uncontrollable.

A convivial companion with his equals, Fielding had, of course, some of the amiable vices—if that be not too strong a word—of the class to which he belonged. Curiously enough, he apparently did not fall in with the fashion of taking snuff, for his most inveterate enemies in their endeavour to give him a slovenly appearance rarely covered his coat with its brown stains. Moreover, these caricature portraits of Fielding “begrimed with snuff”—the phrase is Henley’s—all belong, with one exception, to the period of his youth when he would be the least likely to have the habit. Nor is it quite certain that he smoked tobacco, despite the thick clouds in which the biographers say he sat while writing his books. In no place where he lets us into his daily life do we see him with a pipe. On the voyage to Lisbon, for instance, he does not smoke after his meals or with the captain in the evening. Nor can any safe inference concerning his own use of tobacco be drawn from his characters. Tom Jones and Joseph Andrews do not smoke, because country boys of their age were not accustomed to smoke. On the other hand, Parson Adams always carries a pipe in his pocket because that was the way of country parsons. Obviously, the man who was depicting others as they were, could tell us nothing of himself. In short, all the stories of his smoking have no other authority than the anecdotes which Murphy collected of the novelist in the days before he had ever seen him. He brought them in

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

to explain the rapidity with which Fielding composed the plays of his youth, implying that tobacco kept his brain going at a marvellous pace. Murphy does not assert that Fielding was an inordinate smoker when he knew him, nor that he smoked at all. Writers who smoke while they work know that tobacco acts as a stimulant up to a certain point and then becomes a depressant. It would have been impossible for Fielding to have written his plays in the way he is said to have done. That he was a smoker in his youth may be a reasonable assumption based upon his sociable disposition; it is, however, nothing more. The satirists who pursued him, never gave him, so far as I recall, a pipe; but when he emerged in middle life as a defender of the Pelham Ministry, they gave him a quid of tobacco, which was represented as breaking the easy flow of his speech. How far these caricatures were based upon fact must remain uncertain. Fielding had none of the repugnance to tobacco shown by Shakespeare, whose characters neither smoke nor snuff nor chew the weed. It is on the whole probable that Fielding smoked when a young man, but afterwards laid aside his pipe and chewed when presiding over the Bow Street court. There is, however, no indication that he was ever immoderate in either habit. Nowhere in his books did he write in glory of tobacco.

In his father's household at East Stour, water was held to be an inappropriate drink even for children. The servants of Henry's mother charged his stepmother with cruelty because the beer provided was so insipid that the boy of twelve years had to slake his thirst from the spring. He was, as Hamlet says, to the manner born. There was nothing unusual in this distrust of water. Nobody drank water unadulterated if he could help it. Wine was the drink of gentlemen who could pay for it. On the voyage to Lisbon, the company had claret (which they brought with them) and cider and beer, and rum to make

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

the punch with. It does not appear from the narrative that Fielding drank more than others of the party. As a matter of fact, he seems to have drunk less than some of them. What clearly appears is that he liked wine with his meals, cider between times, and a bowl of punch before going to bed; but the wine or cider must be good, else he left it with a bare taste, and he cared nothing for the punch unless there was conversation to go with it. As Fielding was on “*The Queen of Portugal*,” so he must have always been, for he was a man not likely to change his habits except upon compulsion. Joseph Warton and a friend, the reader will recall, once passed two evenings with him and his sister. Sarah duly retiring, the rest sat up until one or two o’clock in the morning; and very likely the drink was not confined to water. And yet, Warton, who told the story, hinted at no excess. He was charmed by Fielding’s civil demeanour and “inexpressibly diverted” by his conversation.

All we know of Fielding points to the conclusion that he drank freely every day of the pleasant liquors when he could obtain them, just as he ate freely of the viands that gratified his palate. Of gin and other strong spirits he many times expressed abhorrence because they produce intoxication and so interfere with the orderly course of the world’s business, to say nothing of the crimes committed under their influence. Doubtless Fielding’s rule of life, well enough for a country gentleman who lives in the open air, was framed on too liberal lines for a lawyer and man of letters who had little time or opportunity for physical exercise. Gout was the penalty which Fielding paid for the indulgence of his appetites. This, I think, states the case accurately; but I would throw the final emphasis upon his denunciation of the quick intoxicants, which, if he practised what he preached, he avoided, certain that they must be let alone if he were to give the best that was in him to law and literature. And he did give his best. His achievements are

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

a complete refutation of the tradition that his novels and plays were written, as Henley and others have said or implied, in sober intervals between sprees.

The tales of Fielding's dissolute youth which have crept into literature and grown with the fiction they have fed on, have but the shakiest foundation. They originated in the first instance with "The Grub-street Journal," a periodical as malignant and indecent as it was brilliant, which set out to destroy the reputation of a young dramatist who belonged to another set and aligned himself with another party. Any shabby poet, any debauchee, any alehouse ruffian that he introduced into a play this journal did not hesitate to assert or insinuate, whenever it so desired, to be Fielding or an associate. Any erring wife or any painted girl of Covent Garden whom he depicted was known by himself only too well; and any disreputable scene that he placed in a tavern or a brothel was drawn from one of his favourite haunts. In subsequent years the same method of attack was pursued, as we have sufficiently seen, by "The Daily Gazetteer" and "Old England," which raked his works for characters and incidents that might be misinterpreted to his disgrace and dishonour, even in those cases where Fielding's purpose to ridicule folly and vice was clearly manifest. Later writers, coming long after Fielding was dead, when time had obscured the details of the old slanders, sought to confirm the tradition of his profligacy by their own examination of his works. More often than any other passage they have quoted the one in "A Journey from this World to the Next" where the protagonist, on coming to the entrance of the Elysian Fields, and being requested by Judge Minos to state briefly his claims to admittance, declared that he "had never done an injury to any man living, nor avoided an opportunity of doing good," but must confess that he had indulged himself "very freely with wine and women" in his youth. Now, Fielding does

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

make the shade of this gentleman the mouthpiece of many of his own opinions. He probably agreed with Minos that a man against whom can be laid only the follies of youth has earned enduring happiness; but there is no warrant at all for the conclusion that Fielding intended to portray himself in the shadowy figure. Because Fielding writes in the first person, it does not mean that he is speaking of himself, any more than it means that Daniel Defoe is Robinson Crusoe because that novelist chose to write in the first person. In both cases it is merely a question of narrative art. As anyone may see who reads Fielding's fantasy with ordinary attention, the author does not identify himself with the fortunate gentleman who gains quick admittance into Elysium. He is playing with a rather naïve shade, and with Minos also, who, for all his reputed severity, is lenient towards the weaknesses of human nature, perhaps in recollection of his own early days.

A dissolute life can be led only with dissolute companions. Dissolute people enough may be found in Fielding's works from the beginning to the end. He could write a play without a single decent character, though that was not his usual practice. He could write a novel in which all the decent characters are kept in the background, though that, too, was not his usual practice. As in real life, the decent and the indecent mingle; and where the indecent predominate, the social satire, present in all his novels and plays, clearly predominates also. Fielding's own attitude towards his characters is never obscure. He could not, however, have described the contemptible wife, the contemptible husband, the licentious young gentleman, the bawd and her girls, without knowing them. He did know them. They everywhere obtruded themselves upon his sight and society in the Westminster where he lived and did his work. In "The Covent-Garden Tragedy" he exposed on the boards of Drury Lane the entire household of Mother

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Punchbowl; in "Jonathan Wild," he depicted with a few bold strokes the entire gang of a notorious villain. But in neither instance did he display the intimate knowledge which a man would have who was a part of what he described. His was surely not the knowledge of the underworld possessed by French and Russian realists of the present day, not even that possessed by the author of "Oliver Twist." It was the kind of knowledge shown by Shakespeare in his Falstaffian plays, and within narrower limits by Gay in "The Beggar's Opera." In short, it was the knowledge of the keen and critical observer of people and their ways. Fielding was, as one may say, usually well informed; he had the information necessary to his art. Nothing more.

Indeed it was not always so much as this. He cast aside his first draft of "Don Quixote in England" because he felt that the comedy betrayed "too small experience in, and little knowledge of the world." And later, when his dramatic career was long over, he remarked that he ought to have begun writing for the stage at the time he left off. All Fielding knew of Jonathan Wild and his men came from reading an old pamphlet or an old newspaper which he only half remembered. He reproduced but few authentic details; he made but slight use of the slang which all the thieves spoke; and so much as he did use he might have heard any day on the street; nowhere did he re-create the real atmosphere of crime. What he did was to ridicule—satirize is too strong a word—fashionable society of his own day. Wild and his crew were really the beaus, politicians, and fine ladies of questionable reputation of the middle and upper classes from whom he removed the masque of convention and pretence. When their motives were laid bare, society was discovered to be the same in all ranks, for human nature is everywhere the same. Fielding stripped his fine ladies and fine gentlemen of their fine language,

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

and let them give vent, as they no doubt often did in private quarrels, to their emotions in the speech of Billingsgate.

Except in the language they use, there is no essential difference between Lady Booby, Lady Bellaston, and the Laetitia Snap who became the consort of Jonathan Wild—no difference except that Laetitia is the most amusing. They belonged to no one class; they belonged to the world at large; they might be met anywhere. Fielding saw them in town and country; he did not go to the haunts of a Jonathan Wild to discover them. How certain this conclusion is any one knows who has read the pamphlets dealing with crime which he wrote after he became a justice of the peace. He was appalled by what he then saw with his own eyes and by what his constables told him. Hitherto Fielding's acquaintance with the lower strata of London life had been such as any gentleman might have derived from the outside. If his life was dissolute he did not find his associates there. When Jonathan Wild retires to a night-cellar, the narrative always comes to an abrupt end, presumably because Fielding's knowledge had come to an abrupt end also. Only in the most casual way was Fielding's name ever connected with any specific tavern or coffee-house. In the Fielding tradition there is no Mermaid Tavern where Pasquin sat and drank with his fellow playwrights; there is no Cheshire Cheese where his chair is exhibited to credulous visitors. It was long after his death that he was shown in a fanciful picture reading from one of his books at the Bedford Arms in the company of Pope and other wits. His custom was to entertain his friends in his own house. There Rigby saw him; there Warton passed the two long evenings with him. Likewise his friends entertained him at their houses. His appointment with Edward Moore was at the young man's lodgings; his dinners, so far as there is any record or tradition of them, were always with gentlemen. All this does not mean that he did not frequent

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

taverns and coffee-houses; but it means, if it means anything, that he was not notorious for wasting his nights at them.

It becomes necessary, then, to look higher up for his dissolute associates. The friendships which Fielding made at Eton and which may be followed through the greater part of his life included, says Murphy, "many of the first people in the kingdom." They were Lyttelton, Fox (that is, Lord Holland), Pitt, Hanbury Williams, and perhaps Earl Camden. During his dramatic career were added the Duke of Richmond, the Duke of Argyle, the Duke of Roxborough, and Lord Chesterfield. Then and later came the Bench and the Bar who subscribed almost *en masse* to his "Miscellanies," and with them Hogarth, Handel and Garrick, Ralph Allen, the Pelhams and the Duke of Bedford, Dodington, Dr. Ranby and Sanderson Miller, Bishop Hoadly and Dr. Maddox, the Bishop of Worcester. Follow him on the stage and you come not only upon Garrick but upon Wilks and Booth, Colley Cibber, Mrs. Clive, and a score of other actors and actresses whose art he approved. Follow him among the citizen class and you come upon George Lillo the dramatist, whom he loved for his honesty; Mrs. Hussey the mantua-maker in the Strand, whom he admired for her beauty and good temper; and the Whitefields who kept the comfortable inn at Gloucester. Nor should we forget James Harris and Christopher Smart, both of whom left their impressions of the man. Incomplete as the list is, it is a wonderful array of friends and it cuts right down through English life. Not among tavern brawlers and gamesters (though he could not escape them), but in his association with these men and women whom I have named and with many others among whom their friendship carried him, Fielding learned the ways of mankind. Many of them were most convivial companions; some were dissipated and given to gallantry; some were of an austere virtue. Of

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

them all the only one with whom Fielding is known to have quarrelled was Colley Cibber, whom he charged with having no sense of shame.

And this brings us to his dealings with women. In Fielding's works appear all kinds of women. There are prudes who pretend to abhor men, and these he exposes; there are girls made happy by the prospect of marriage, and wives devoted to their husbands,—and these he compliments and approves; there are the girls of Covent Garden who seem equally happy in the prospect of a single constant lover, and ladies who have lovers besides their husbands,—and these he treats with humorous indulgence. When he wrote his first two novels, a beautiful and honest woman was by his side; when he wrote his last two, she lived in his memory. Always her qualities, in varying measure, passed into the novel he happened to be writing—into Fanny Andrews, Mrs. Heartfree, Sophia Western, and Amelia Booth. Many times he discoursed on love in the tone of that well-known initial chapter to the sixth book of “*Tom Jones*,” where he considers the passion as youthful desire, as the gross appetite of sensual manhood, and as “a great and exquisite delight” when it has “gratitude and esteem” for its basis. There is no idealizing; he takes men and women as he finds them, adding the comment that “the amiable sex” is “treated with a very unjust severity by ours, who censure them for faults (if they are truly such) into which we allure and betray them.” Women, it is everywhere clear, were to him eternally interesting; for all their whims he never lost respect for them; they were the best part of God's creation, and it was a gentleman's duty to shield them from insult. In his presence, as we see from “*A Voyage to Lisbon*” and elsewhere, it was dangerous for a man to obtrude upon a lady's privacy or to fail in the etiquette which the world prescribed as her due. This is the man whom Henley eulogized as a libertine.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

What, to abridge it in a paragraph, was the course run by Fielding in youth? In his veins flowed the blood of a young army officer and a squire's daughter who married the man she would have, against the will of her father and mother. His mother dead, his father married again, he was left to the indulgent care of an aged grandmother who could have exerted no control over an impetuous and strong-willed boy. Having acquired some Latin and less Greek at Eton, he travelled with his valet through the West, visiting relatives and friends in search of recreation and pleasure. When but eighteen years old, the time had come, he concluded, to marry; and he went down to Lyme Regis by the sea and attempted to carry off the charming Sarah Andrew—an heiress of fifteen summers, who had no father or mother then living, no brothers or sisters to share the estate. It was a glorious adventure for a high-spirited youth. He won Sarah's heart, but the abduction miscarried because of the strict watch set over her by an uncle who wanted her for his own son. The Eton boy stormed and raged, and threatened to maim or kill whoever stood in the way to his possession of the lovely girl. All was in vain; the passion and strength of youth could not prevail against the stratagems of an older head. Such was the wild and headlong dash of the boy when spurred on by the romance and the animal within him. He was studious, too, knowing his books much better than his own heart. He opened his Juvenal at the Sixth Satire, paraphrased the worst that the Roman could say of women, and supposed himself rid of the inconstant sex forever. Thereafter he wrote a comedy reminiscent of his failure with Miss Andrew, submitted it to his cousin Lady Mary, and importuned her to aid him with the managers of Drury Lane. No more than anyone else could this woman of the world hold out against the handsome boy, insistent upon gaining his ends, but withal perfectly mannered. His comedy

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

having run the usual three nights, he went over to Leyden for more Latin and more Greek; he sketched out another play while there; and then returned to London with his mind made up to win fame and money by writing for the stage. He often visited his grandmother at Salisbury, attended the assemblies there, complimented the girls he danced with, made sober love to the most beautiful of them all, and married her, perhaps eloped with her, as soon as he had gained a name. For ten years they lived together; then she died, and he mourned her loss to the verge of insanity. Three years later, he married her maid, who became the mother of all but one of the children destined to survive him.

This is the story. I do not mean to enroll Henry Fielding among the saints of this world, for their rigid discipline and circumspection bored him; their lives lacked colour and variety; and many of them, he discovered, were hypocrites. He was a gentleman who flourished in the reign of George the Second, and it would be hazardous to give any gentleman of that period a clean bill. One may argue, as Dobson has argued, that a man of Fielding's temperament must have been often overpowered by the sex instinct; that there must have been, as Henley has said, many "accidental women" in the course of his career. But this conclusion is not necessarily true. Against it stands the fact that there is no evidence that Fielding ever consorted with lewd women. His name was never associated with any woman of questionable character. The sex instinct, however strong and imperious, may manifest itself quite differently from the ways surmised by Dobson and Henley. Among the prime characteristics which Murphy gave Fielding was unusual constancy in his attachments. So far as anyone knows, what overmastered Fielding was the vehemence of his passion at a given time for a particular woman. He would marry Miss Andrew, whatever the obstacles; when

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

he failed there, he would marry Miss Cradock, whatever the obstacles; when she died, Mary Daniel must become the mother of his children. In all three instances, Fielding asserted to the utmost the rights of his manhood in defiance of custom. Grave people looked askance upon him in youth and in age because he did not conform in his life and in his works to the settled *mores* of citizen morality. But no dis-honour can be attached to his conduct. No woman, picked up and discarded, has yet been discovered in his life; nor any attempt to steal away the wife of a friend. What Wordsworth did or what Thackeray did, has never been recorded of Fielding.

Fielding's memory should also be eased somewhat of that heavy burden of poverty which it has had to bear. It has always been taken for granted that the playwright worked and slept a good deal of the time in a garret. His poems addressed to Walpole are of course the source of the legend. Chaucer, as is well known, once complained to his royal master that his purse was empty and averred that unless it were filled he should die. But no biographer of Chaucer has yet appeared so lacking in humour as to declare on the authority of a half-serious poem that the poet's purse was literally empty or that he was at the point of starvation. Fielding's lines were equally playful. In his time the garret was the abode of literary hacks in the employ of booksellers. Fielding was not of them; they were his butt throughout his entire literary career. Had Fielding really written his lines to Walpole in a garret, we may be certain that the fact would never have been embodied in the poem. He merely placed himself in a garret as a point of vantage for taking the Prime Minister to task for his utter neglect of letters. He was but following a literary convention such as Hogarth followed in that sketch of the Distrest Poet in a garret trying to write a poem on riches, while Pope in the background is thrashing Curril, the pirate and scoundrel.

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

Though some of Fielding's plays failed, they were on the whole most successful. In general, he never had more money in his pocket than while writing for the stage, with no family dependent upon him. Especially abundant was the harvest of 1730 when he described himself as locked close in a garret besieged by duns and never dining. It was the year of the immense runs of "Tom Thumb" and "The Author's Farce."

The trouble came with his marriage, soon after which the Licensing Act gave a quietus to his dramatic career and he had to go through the long and laborious preparation for the law while supporting at the same time his family. He was then forced into journalism, from which he could never permanently free himself. He began also to be visited by attacks of the gout; his wife and daughter fell ill and died; and he was sued for debt. Afterwards he became surety for a friend to the amount of £400, which the friend let him pay; and perhaps the sheriff appeared and placed an attachment on his goods. These are all distressing incidents; but too much may be made of them; they do not give the true colour of his career. He made money by his novels, pamphlets, miscellanies, and newspapers, two of which perhaps enjoyed the patronage of friends in the Government. He had an additional income from the law; and while a justice of the peace he received a pension supplementary to the fees of his office. Only at times did he feel the pinch of poverty; there was no threatened starvation of which Henley wrote carelessly.

Ordinarily, we find Fielding, when we can get a glimpse of him, living comfortably and spending money freely. A boy home from Eton, he had his valet, and on the voyage to Lisbon he was accompanied by a footman. His first and his second wife were both provided with maids. In anticipation of bringing Charlotte and the children up to London in 1739, he asked his bookseller to procure a house for him

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

at an annual rental of forty pounds. He would take a lease, he said, for seven years; but the house must have a large parlour and be among the lawyers near the Middle Temple. His wife dying at Bath some years later, he brought her body up to London and buried her in the Vicar's vault in the Church of St. Martin's in the Fields. The twelve pounds necessary to this honour he had at the very time when it is supposed that he was at the nadir of his fortunes. Likewise when his goods may have been distrained for the payment of that £400, he was living in one of the best houses in Old Boswell Court, a favourite quarter for the lawyers; and for some time he continued to live there and to go on with "*Tom Jones*" which he was then writing. His house in Bow Street was rated at sixty-three pounds.\* The houses associated with his name at Bath, Salisbury, and Twickenham were also such as befitted the residence of a gentleman.

In his early days he had an estate at East Stour, and in his later days, a farm at Fordhook. If Allen and Lyttelton were generous friends, he probably gave away much more than he ever received from them. When manager of the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, his announcements of benefits to people in distress were frequent. When a justice of the peace he remitted the fees of the poor, contributed to funds in aid of unfortunate tradesmen, and was a subscriber to hospitals. He appears to have aided in the support of his sisters, to have taken into his own household two spinsters who grew up with them at Salisbury, and to have kept an open table when living in Bow Street. Withal he managed to collect a working library unsurpassed by any man of letters of the period. And at his death he left an estate sufficient to pay his just debts.† A writer of the

\* Mr. J. Paul de Castro, "*The Modern Language Review*," April, 1917, p. 233.

† Letter of Sir John Fielding to Lord Barrington, Dec. 16, 1756, in manuscript "*Letters, Miscellaneous*," 1758, A to L, at the War Office, London.

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

eighteenth century who had to earn his bread could hope for no better end than this. Fielding himself had but one regret. He grieved that illness, coming upon him in middle life, prevented him from making any provision for his family, and he at once set out, forgetful of himself, to do all that he then could for their immediate relief after his death. Had he lived ten years more, he should have left a substantial income for his wife and children; he should have been knighted like those who came before and after him in the Bow Street office, and so died as Sir Henry Fielding, to the complete satisfaction of all Philistines.

His methods of composition were not very different from those of other men who make literature their profession. Whether a writer proceeds slowly or rapidly depends upon a variety of circumstances. Much of his work must be done under pressure, and when such work is successful he is usually not averse to telling the public how quickly it was thrown off. Shakespeare has the reputation of writing "*The Merry Wives of Windsor*" in a fortnight in order to please a Queen who could wait no longer to see how Falstaff would behave when in love; Molière, it is said, asked for no more than three days for the composition of a farce urgently demanded by the players; and Richardson boasted that all those letters comprising the first part of "*Pamela*" required but two quiet months of him, so easily did they flow from his pen. Fielding in "*Eurydice Hiss'd*" led his audience to infer that he was good for nine scenes of a farce every day when at his best, while at other times his Muse treated him badly. In another mood, he gave his readers the impression that "*Tom Jones*" was composed at full leisure as befits a masterpiece; though he probably never wrote more pages a day than when engaged upon that novel. Taken with what he said when more off his guard, his works are evidence that he experienced all the pleasures, all the labours, all the troubles, which have made the literary

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

career a mixture of delight and pain to everyone who has followed it seriously as a source for bread. In youth and in middle life, his mind worked with equal ease; he could write a play, a novel, or a pamphlet at any time, I daresay, when he set himself to the task. But despite his genius, he was no more certain than other writers have been of the outcome. This is especially true of his plays. Some of them had to be reworked before they attained their full success; others, however great the labour expended upon them, partially or completely failed. Sometimes the author knew what were their inherent faults and sometimes he could not see them at all. In these respects, there was nothing very extraordinary about Fielding.

Certainly much more extraordinary than these details were the conditions under which a large part of his work was produced. He trained himself to write at times when one would expect him to be distracted by other occupations and things. He was the manager of a theatre when he brought out his two great political satires; he was a student of the law when he edited "*The Champion*"; his entire family, including himself, was ill when he wrote "*Jonathan Wild*"; he was editing "*The Jacobite's Journal*" when he expended those thousands of hours on "*Tom Jones*"; he was a justice of the peace, liable to be waked at night to sign a commitment, while he was writing in turn "*Amelia*," "*The Covent-Garden Journal*," and legal pamphlets which required the most painstaking care. This is the really marvellous aspect of Fielding's career as author. He had a constitution that could endure long days of labour running far into the night, an equally tireless mind, a memory stored with facts and incidents, and a will in supreme command.

Fielding was not an inept "dramatic adventurer" (again it is Henley's phrase), who was suddenly transformed into a consummate novelist. His works, though they unroll in different patterns, were really all of a piece. No writer

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

was ever more uniformly himself. Utterly false is the notion that he depicted, at any point in his career, the vices and follies of his time because, being contaminated by them, he either liked to describe them for that reason or was unaware how despicable were some of the characters he drew. The assumption, in its extreme form, leaves out of account his men of all ranks and ages having no ingrained vices and his honest women of unusual charm taken from the different walks of life—the tradesman's wife, the country girl, the squire's daughter, and the mate of a poor army officer. Still, it is true that Fielding's works, regarded as a whole, show a preponderance of characters who do not approach moral perfection, who have in the aggregate all the weaknesses, follies, and positive vices which we ascribe to the frailty of human nature. Nevertheless, the reason given for this undisputed fact is wholly at fault. Fielding, who knew men and women in all stations, knew exactly what he was doing. His was a wonderfully penetrating mind. Where a Richardson saw only perfection, he discovered flaws; where Richardson saw unrelieved vice, he saw streaks of something that resembled goodness, such as the transient compunction of Jonathan Wild for the pain inflicted upon his victims. Likewise, the four lewd women in "*Tom Jones*"—Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, and Lady Bellaston, each carefully differentiated from the others in accordance with the grade of society to which she belonged—are given in union with their predominant weakness those admirable qualities which they possessed in real life. "There is not a village," remarked Samuel Butler, "of 500 inhabitants in England but has its Mrs. Quickly and *Tom Jones*." Shakespeare portrayed with a sure hand the one, and Fielding uncovered and interpreted with a complete art the other. The young Tom Jones, formerly unknown to himself, is revealed exactly as he was with all his follies and virtues. Other novelists—

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Thackeray among them—have tried to repeat the achievement, and their genius has failed them.

Had Fielding been questioned by a candid critic, he would, of course, have frankly admitted that he threw the emphasis on the unheroic side of human nature; but he would have remarked that his want of balance was much less pronounced than Swift's or even Hogarth's, and that it was made necessary, such as it was, by his art. His aim, he might have added in explanation, was always social satire, whether he wrote a play, a novel, or an essay. Herein lies the unity and consistency of Fielding's literary career. Obviously, social satire of this kind has nothing to do with perfections; it must deal with faults and imperfections. Half-seriously he used to say that, while he had no hope of converting the wicked, his works might contribute to the correction of manners by laughing mankind out of “their favourite follies and vices” when they do not cut too deeply into the character. If Fielding's purpose is not always apparent, it is owing partly to a remarkable poise inherent in his character and partly to a temperament which took a humorous delight, when once in the swing of it, in showing up the foibles and weaknesses of poor humanity. He was at once too judicious and too genial to be a complete satirist of the usual type. He was a satirist who rarely felt the *saeva indignatio* of a Swift or a Smollett. He had too few personal hatreds and he loved the world too much for that.

Naturally, his delight in the world, always intense, was most exultant in youth. In the plays he wrote then, he let himself go, as we say, regardless of consequences. All the life of Covent Garden and its neighbourhood to the west he displayed in farce, burlesque, or serious comedy. In some of its phases, that life at the point where the world of fashion found its instruments of pleasure was utterly shameless. But whatever Fielding saw there he put into

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

his plays without hesitation whenever it was convenient for him to do so. It was life just as it really was; and why not make comedies out of it? Why disguise it under conventional reticence? So long as the game he pursued was confined to the innocuous gallantry of beaus and frivolous women, to the mischance of lotteries, the absurdities of the stage, or the inane disputes of coffee-house politicians, his theatre was filled. Everybody outside the Court party also ran to see his election scenes, in which he showed how members of Parliament obtained their seats. His wit and humour in some of these plays, never afterwards surpassed, no one could withstand; the *gaudium vitae* of the author was irresistible; and the ridicule mainly hit follies and the lighter vices. His political satires were, indeed, the immediate occasion of his undoing, because they gave offence to the Government; but they pleased his audience even more than anything else he had ever written.

His theatre was deserted only when his social satire assumed a graver note, when he depicted, holding his wit and humour in abeyance, the most detestable vices of men and women who sat in the boxes. These serious comedies were too true to life, their scenes were too suggestive of well-known resorts, and their characters sometimes seemed to point to definite persons. They turned, it was declared, upon incidents which had better be kept concealed, and they were all condemned as indecent. Like the rest of us, Fielding had the misfortune to be young once. He lacked discretion then; he lacked taste; he obeyed, without heeding what people might say or think, the impulse of his genius. Absorbed in his characters and their intrigues, he often failed to make his meaning clear, perhaps because the drama did not give him sufficient scope, and he had to pay the penalty. The audience and the critics damned him. They would not sit and see the degenerates of the fashionable world play their parts openly and boldly on the stage

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

under the guidance of a young playwright who had hitherto entertained them mostly with farce. His humour was altogether too direct to please anybody. And yet the plays that awakened the loudest hue and cry are the very ones that were written, as we now see, with a distinct moral purpose, which the public ignored or resented. Contrary, then, to the opinion of hasty readers, not only was Fielding's aim social satire when he wrote the plays of his youth, but he was then becoming the moralist and preacher such as he appears in his most mature novels and pamphlets. Much of "*The Modern Husband*" went into "*Amelia*," linking definitely Fielding's youth with his mature manhood.

Fielding's experiences while writing for the stage taught him the limits of an art which he afterwards practised with more even, though not uniform, success. He saw that he could moralize and preach provided there was humour for the leaven; that he could waylay the vicious but that it must be from an ambush; the blow must be struck from the side or from behind, not full in the face after the manner of a Juvenal. It will be remembered that the playwright in "*A Journey from this World to the Next*," who anticipated an easy entrance into the Elysian Fields because his dramatic works had done "so much in recommending virtue and punishing vice," was doomed to disappointment; for he learned from Minos, sitting by the gate, that one generous deed performed during his life on earth availed more with the judge than the remembrance of all his plays. The inference to be drawn from this humorous incident is that Fielding came to have little or no faith in the corrective influence of unrelieved satire such as he had occasionally attempted to his disaster. By the time the Licensing Act broke up his theatre, he had learned that ridicule was the proper weapon. On this subject he then dilated in a vigorous reply to a critic who had accused him and Gay of

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

corrupting the age because many of their characters were shamelessly immoral. One hot paragraph runs :

“ You seem to think, Sir, that to ridicule Vice, is, to serve its Cause. And you mention the late ingenious Mr. *Gay*, who, you say, in his *Beggars Opera* hath made Heroes and Heroines of Highwaymen and Whores. Are then Impudence, Boldness, Robbery, and picking Pockets the Characteristicks of a Hero? Indeed, Sir, we do not always approve what we laugh at. So far from it, Mr. *Hobbes* will tell you that Laughter is a Sign of Contempt. And by raising such a Laugh as this against Vice, *Horace* assures us we give a sorcer Wound, than it receives from all the Abhorrence which can be produced by the gravest and bitterest Satire. You will not hardly, I believe, persuade us, how much soever you may desire it, that it is the Mark of a great Character to be laughed at by a whole Kingdom.”\*

Ridicule, then, the art which Fielding mastered as a playwright, became the essence of his social satire. In his later plays and in “The Champion” which followed them, he literally raised the laugh of “a whole Kingdom” against the Prime Minister, his associates in office, and his poet laureate. Subsequently he raised the laugh against the English Jacobites, against Foote and Dr. Hill and the tribe of Grub Street. But whenever he lost his self-control, as he sometimes did under unusual provocation, he lost his wit also; he then became grossly abusive and failed to hit the mark at which he aimed just as had happened in some of his immature plays.

It is not to be inferred that Fielding’s ridicule, considered as a whole, was ever narrowly personal. He rarely drew satiric portraits of his contemporaries like those we have from Pope and Dryden. On the contrary, his ridicule was wide in its scope and it grew wider with age. It did indeed

\* “Common Sense,” May 21, 1737.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

always originate, if I understand the realist correctly, in some trait, weakness, or moral obliquity of a person whom he had actually seen and in many cases had studied carefully. Of course this is a proposition that cannot be proved; but so far as we are able to follow Fielding in his life, it is found to be true. Besides Walpole and Cibber, a score of other names recorded in this book are instances in point. Walpole came into Fielding's works early and remained there for some time after his fall from power. Cibber, once in, had to stay there until Fielding's death. The Prime Minister and the poet laureate he often held up to ridicule with only such disguise as was necessary to evade the law against libel. In both cases Fielding sometimes dropped the screen whenever he wished to show the face behind. But except in these and other stray instances, he did not wish to show the face behind, and he kept the screen up. In different words, though it was Fielding's habit to begin with some man or woman definitely in mind, he generalized his ridicule. This I believe to be true of his plays and novels alike, except certain early imitations of Congreve's characters. By thus passing from the individual to the species, Fielding brought the art of social satire to the highest perfection in his power.

Take, for example, his treatment of Walpole. I do not mean the violent political attacks upon him that disfigure "The Champion," most of which were written by Ralph, but the ridicule that came before and after. In one play Fielding presented to his audience the career of Tom Thumb, an insignificant fellow, who has all the vulgar passions and ambitions of the great man as we find him in history and romance. Fielding did not label him Walpole, and the pigmy soldier was not in exteriors a portrait of Walpole; but the audience must have recognized in Tom Thumb the salient mental and moral characteristics of their Prime Minister, who was the so-called "great man" of

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

the age. In another play we see Mr. Quidum, a fiddler, who bribes a company of patriots, dances a jig with them, and leaves the stage in their company. Again, it is Walpole, but by indirection. And there is the mature "Jonathan Wild the Great," which is burlesque such as we have in "Tom Thumb the Great" transformed into a masterpiece of irony. Walpole's name is not mentioned in the novel; nor does it contain a single incident literally true of Walpole. It depicts the career of a man who flourished for a period as a receiver of stolen goods and was eventually hanged. In its wider application, it seeks to show that there is ordinarily no connection between greatness and goodness, success and merit. The book may be read for the story of a man who lost his life at Tyburn or for the elaborate moral. And yet it was wholly inspired by Walpole, whose character it has consigned to eternal obloquy. Fielding may have been wrong in his opinion of his Prime Minister; research may seek to rectify his views; but nothing can prevail against genius. So far as literature is concerned, Walpole has found his resting place among the arrant villains of all time.

Or take the case of Cibber. He is Marplay, an ignorant stage-manager, who mutilates the plays of Shakespeare as well as those of young gentlemen about town before he will bring them out, calling it improving them; he is Ground-Ivy who does the same thing and asserts his superiority over all other actors and authors that ever lived. He addresses his King in silly odes which even Grub Street refuses to read; he is a poet whose laurel so withers that it becomes at last almost invisible; he writes an apology for his life in so wretched a style that he is arrested and tried for murdering the English language. Fielding pursued the laureate through all this banter, and then took a leap forward to a frailty more strictly moral. Cibber, in his autobiography, boasted the possession of most of the

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

virtues he had read of, but conceded that he could put in no claim for chastity, being incontinent by nature, and feeling besides that too great stress was placed by philosophers and moralists upon a rule of life which few men of his time observed with any degree of uniformity. Somehow, he thought, there must be a mistake here. Now, whenever Cibber comes into Fielding's works, the reference or allusion is always unmistakable; the ridicule is always direct. Nevertheless, even in this extreme case, there is always a sort of extension of the ridicule. Fielding's shafts are aimed not only at Cibber but at the custom of amending and making over Shakespeare's plays, at poor poets who scatter their effusions through the newspapers, at scribblers who have no knowledge of the syntax of the English language and who do not know the meaning of the words they use. In short, Cibber becomes in the humorist's hands the type of vainglorious and impudent ignorance. And when Fielding writes "*Joseph Andrews*," making the hero very sensitive to the observance of the one virtue which Cibber distrusted, the initial laugh at Cibber is soon lost in the all-embracing social satire.

And there is Richardson. In this case the point of attack is not the author at all, but his book. The man who told Sarah Fielding that the manners depicted in her brother's novels would have been no worse had he been bred an ostler or a runner at a sponging-house, merely evoked the reply from Fielding that Mr. Richardson could hardly hope to reform the age by imposing upon it manners worse than those existing anywhere in town or country. This is Fielding's only fling at Richardson. Fielding never wrote of Richardson the man with disrespect. He knew of course all the vanities of that fussy author as well as he knew Cibber's; but he strove to keep his ridicule impersonal. He was concerned only with the man's novels, which, apart from the opening letters of "*Clarissa Harlowe*," he be-

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

lieved to be false and commentitious when tested by contemporary manners or more broadly by human nature. And what did he do? He wrote a novel on the lines of "Pamela," descriptive of life as he had seen it in the country, true in all exterior details as well as in sentiment and motive; true also to the primal emotions which, *mutatis mutandis*, have always governed the conduct of men and women.

Intending at first nothing but parody, Fielding created at a stroke a kind of novel which eventually displaced the *Pamelas*. Richardson's sentimental rendering of life possesses, it is true, a vitality which keeps his novels still alive. But against it have ever worked the truth and sanity of Fielding. The novel of contemporary manners, notwithstanding its many devious courses, goes back to Fielding, its perennial spring. The ridicule which he put upon "Pamela" is as fresh and potent now as it was in the days of George the Second; it excites the same laughter—not against a man, not wholly against one of his books, but against a portrayal of life which rarely perceives the real thing beneath convention, pretence, and hypocrisy.

Thus by ridicule Fielding arrived at a true art of fiction, and afterwards fixed it in a masterpiece. "Joseph Andrews" cannot be quite understood unless it be read in conjunction with "Pamela." So "Jonathan Wild" equally loses if it be considered apart from the career of Sir Robert Walpole. "Tom Jones" has likewise a very real background of scene and character. Besides Ralph Allen, there are many other models, as I have pointed out, on which Fielding's keen perception worked for the men and women who people this novel. But "Tom Jones" differs from its predecessors in that it is not closely correlated with any literary or political event of the time similar to the publication of Richardson's first novel or the fall of Walpole from power. It is but loosely connected with the Jacobite

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

insurrection. The novel was written by a man become mature by reading, observation, and reflection. His mind played in banter and ridicule with the religions, philosophies, and social ideas of the age, resting firmly on his recollection of countless men and women of all ranks and degrees who had been a part of his own life. He took so much as he wanted and left the rest.

Excepting Allworthy, he drew no portrait that approaches a literal transcript. No one was made angry because of the personalities of "Tom Jones," for there were none. So far as the novel gave offence, it was because certain readers did not relish Fielding's treatment of the class or group or tribe to which they belonged. The critics did not like the many castigations they received from his hands, and they retaliated. The Jacobites resented Squire Western and they scolded Fielding for him. And men and women whose morality consisted in the outward observance of formulas and rules denounced the novelist who let people like them run their course and finally exposed their pretence to virtues which they had not. "Tom Jones" is the best example that English fiction affords of pure comedy, pure ridicule, sustained through hundreds of pages. There is no personal satire—no personal abuse. Everywhere, except in the eulogies which Fielding pronounces upon his great contemporaries, the individual is submerged in the species.

The novel is a summary of the age by a man who turned upon it the light of an extraordinary intelligence, who was besides infinitely wise and sagacious, and tolerant of human errors and follies where the heart remains true. By a further extension, "Tom Jones" becomes, as Fielding willed it, an epic of human nature. The passions of mankind never change; it is only the modes of their manifestation that change. Fielding knew this and addressed his shrewd and humorous comment to all time. And he employed for his purpose a style and a manner so sound and

## FIELDING AS HE WAS

so impressive that age seems unable to abate the glory of the achievement.

After "Tom Jones" the sphere of Fielding's art contracted appreciably under the influence of the justice's court. There was no declination in his intellectual powers. He grew in wisdom rather than lost. But the human wreckage, exposed to his view every day, tended more and more to subdue his humour and to awaken a desire to cure society of specific ills. Besides writing "Amelia," he let pass no occasion for promulgating in pamphlet after pamphlet his ideas direct and unadulterated by fiction. He would simplify court procedure; he would revise the penal code; he would infuse new life into the administration of the law; he would establish an efficient police; he would put an end to robbery and murder; he would mitigate the suffering of the poor.

It has seemed to many a violent transition from the man who wrote "Tom Thumb" to this ardent reformer—indeed as if there were two personalities called Henry Fielding. The differences between the Fielding of 1730 and the Fielding of 1750 are, however, more apparent than real. They are no greater than one should expect in a man who lived the life he lived. His development under the stress of changing circumstance was perfectly natural and logical, like the development of a great character in a great novel. He had a mind most responsive to his immediate surroundings; and therein lay the prime element of his genius. Seeing things as they were, he always liked so to represent them; he liked to preach and moralize as well. The most laughable farces of his youth, his regular comedies, and his political satires, all had their moral or corrective inferences. He would drive from the stage ranting tragedy, pantomime, and the Italian opera; he would expose social degenerates masquerading in fair forms; he would uncover all the devices and stratagems of

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the corrupt politician, whether of his own or of another party. He was a pamphleteer long before he took his seat in the Bow Street court. He never showed greater zeal for the public welfare than in his open addresses to the people of Great Britain during the Jacobite rebellion or in the hundreds of articles which he placed at the front of his first newspapers.

With the fall of Walpole and the suppression of the Jacobites, the great public questions were no longer narrowly and fiercely political. Party spirit cooled. The Patriots, firmly in power, were giving their attention to measures for the improvement of the lower classes; and his friends in the party made Fielding the principal justice of the peace for Westminster. Just as had happened when he was playwright, novelist, and political writer, he reflected completely the new environment. From his court, from his pen, came the information on which were framed laws for the decrease of crime. To this one end he laboured day and night, sacrificing his health and finally his life.

By an inevitable process the wit and humorist passed into the moralist and reformer. The permanent loss to literature was immense; but the immediate gain to society was immense also. At the same time his last post brought out all the finest qualities of Henry Fielding's nature and touched the close of his career with quiet heroism.

THE END

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the main division of this bibliography are described the first editions of Fielding's separate publications, and occasionally a second or a third edition if it has peculiar interest. To these are subjoined many later editions, British and foreign, in their chronological order. In these supplementary lists no claim, of course, can be made to completeness. Of the numerous collections of Fielding's works since 1762, only those are mentioned which contain additional material. The rest are properly neglected, inasmuch as they contributed nothing towards a wider view of Fielding's literary activity. Where no place is given with a date, London is to be presumed; and all measurements are by inches. The few abbreviations are self-explanatory, except perhaps *p. l.*, used for preliminary leaf or leaves. *Gent. Mag.* is short for *The Gentleman's Magazine*; likewise *London Mag.* for *The London Magazine*. The newspapers, which are cited as authority for dates, were all published in London. It is important to distinguish between "The Daily Post" and "The London Daily Post, and General Advertiser," of which the latter appears here without its sub-title. *In Yale*, following a date or a bibliographical description, means that the particular edition is in the Library of Yale University. Similarly, *Brit. Mus.* and *Bodleian* mean respectively the Library of the British Museum and the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

### I

#### FIELDING'S PUBLISHED WORKS

1728

THE | MASQUERADE, | A | POEM. | INSCRIBED TO | C - - - T  
H - - D - - G - - R. | — | — *Velut ægri somnia, vanæ* | — *Species*—  
Hor. Art. Poet. | — | By LEMUEL GULLIVER, | Poet Laureat to the  
King of LILLIPUT. | — | [Cut] | — | LONDON, | Printed, and sold

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

by J. ROBERTS, in Warwick-lane; | and A. DODD, at the Peacock, without Temple-bar. | MDCCXXVIII. | [Price Six-pence.]

1 p. l. (Title); 11 pp. 8 x 5.

Published Jan. 29, 1728 (*Craftsman*, Jan. 27). In Yale. Published with *The Grub-Street Opera*, 1731. Title and paging the same, but Dedication (2 pp.) added. In Yale. Published in *The Miscellaneous Works of Dr. Arbuthnot*, Glasgow, 1750; 2d ed., 1751, vol. II, pp. 5-18, with Dedication. In Yale. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

LOVE | IN SEVERAL | MASQUES. | A | COMEDY, | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL, | BY | His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | Written by Mr. FIELDING. | — | *Nec Veneris Pharetris macer est, nec Lampade fervet; Inde faces ardent; veniunt a Dote Sagittæ.* | Juv. Sat. 6. | — | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN WATTS, at the Printing Office | in *Wild-Court*, near *Lincoln's-Inn-Fields*. 1728. | [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

5 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable the Lady Mary Wortley Mountague," Preface, Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); [3]-82 pp.; 1 l. (Epilogue). 7½ x 4¾.

First performed Feb. 16, 1728 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 16). Published Feb. 23, 1728 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 23). In Yale.

Dublin, 1728; *Ger. tr.* Strasburg, 1782; Mannheim, n. d.

1730

THE | TEMPLE BEAU. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE in *Goodman's-Fields*. | — | Written by Mr. FIELDING. | — | *Non aliter, quam qui adverso vix Flumine Lembum | Remigiis subigit. Virg. Georg. | Indignor quidquam reprehendi, non quia crassè | Compositum, illepidèe putetur, sed quia Nobis.* | Hor. Art. Poet. | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS, at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincolns-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCCXXX. [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

2 p. l. (Title, Adv., Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 80 pp.; [4] pp. (Epilogue, 2 Songs, Adv.). 7½ x 4¾.

First performed Jan. 26, 1730 (*Daily Post*, Jan. 26). Published Feb. 2, 1730 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 2). In Yale.

Dublin, 1730. In Yale; *Ger. tr.* Mannheim, 1782. In Yale; Mannheim, n. d.

THE | AUTHOR'S FARCE; | AND THE | *Pleasures of the Town.* | As Acted at the | THEATRE in the *Hay-Market*. | — | Written by Scrib-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*lerus Secundus.* | — | — *Quis inique* | *Tam patiens urbis, tam fer-  
reus, ut teneat se?* | *Juv. Sat. I.* | = | *LONDON:* | Printed for  
J. ROBERTS, in *Warwick-Lane.* | — | *MDCCXXX.* [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

4 p. l. (Title, Prologue, 2 Songs, Persons in the Farce, Persons in the Puppet-  
Show); 59 pp.; [4] pp. (Epilogue).  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ .

First performed March 30, 1730 (*Daily Post*, March 30). Published March  
31, 1730 (*Daily Post*, March 31). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1730. In Yale; Dublin, 1730. In Yale; London,  
1734 (?); 3d ed. London, 1750. In Yale. Only revised version, 1750, ever  
reprinted in Fielding's Works.

*TOM THUMB.* | A | TRAGEDY. | As it is Acted at the |  
THEATRE | IN THE | *HAY-MARKET.* | — | [Cut] | = | *LONDON,* |  
Printed: And Sold by J. ROBERTS in | *Warwick-Lane.* 1730.

4 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Adv., *Dramatis Personæ*); 16 pp.  $7\frac{1}{16} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ .

First performed April 24, 1730 (*Daily Post*, April 23). Published April 24,  
1730 (Adv.), but April 25, 1730 (*Daily Post*, April 25). In Yale.

*TOM THUMB.* | A | TRAGEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE  
| IN THE | *HAY-MARKET.* | — | Written by *Scriblerus Secundus.* |  
— | — *Tragicus plerumque dolet Sermone pedestri. Hor.* | — | The  
SECOND EDITION. | — | *LONDON,* | Printed: And Sold by J. ROBERTS  
in | *Warwick-Lane.* 1730. | [Price Six Pence.]

4 p. l. (Title, Preface, Prologue, Epilogue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 16 pp.  
 $8 \times 5$ . In Yale.

This revised Tom Thumb, with prologue and epilogue, first performed May 1;  
with the new scenes, May 7, 1730 (*Daily Post*, May 1 and May 7).

3d ed. London, 1730. In Yale; Dublin, 1730.

Neither 1st, 2d, nor 3d edition ever reprinted in Fielding's Works.

RAPE upon RAPE; OR, THE | JUSTICE | *Caught in his own  
TRAP.* | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | Theatre in the  
*Hay-Market.* | — | [Cut] | = | *LONDON:* | Printed for J. WATS, at  
the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court near Lincolns-Inn Fields.* | — |  
*MDCCXXX.* | Price One Shilling and Six Pence.

4 p. l. (Title, Prologue, Epilogue, Adv., *Dramatis Personæ*); 78 pp.  
 $7\frac{5}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

First performed June 23, 1730 (*Daily Post*, June 23). Published June 23,  
1730 (*Daily Post*, June 23). In Yale.

THE | *Coffee-House Politician;* | OR, THE | JUSTICE | *Caught in  
his own TRAP.* | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | Theatre

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Royal in *Lincoln's Inn-Fields*. | — | Written by MR. FIELDING.  
| — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS, at the  
Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincolns-Inn Fields*. | — |  
MDCCXXX. | Price One Shilling and Six Pence.

4 p. l. (Title, Prologue, Epilogue, Adv., Dramatis Personæ); 78 pp.  
7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Adv. is dated Nov. 27, 1730.

First performed Dec. 4, 1730 (*Daily Journal*, Dec. 4). Published Dec. 17,  
1730 (*Grub-st. Journal*, Dec. 17). In Yale.

This is the second edition of *Rape upon Rape* and the Epilogue varies.

## 1731

THE | TRAGEDY | OF | TRAGEDIES; | OR THE | LIFE and  
DEATH | OF | TOM THUMB *the Great*. | As it is Acted at the |  
THEATRE in the *Hay-Market*. | With the ANNOTATIONS of | *H.*  
*SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS*. | = | LONDON, | Printed; And Sold  
by *J. Roberts* in *Warwick-Lane*. | — | MDCC XXXI. | Price One  
Shilling.

4 p. l. (Title, Preface, Dramatis Personæ); 58 pp. Plate by W. Hogarth.  
7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ .

First performed March 24, 1731 (*Daily Post*, March 23). Published March  
24, 1731 (*Daily Post*, March 23; also *Gent. Mag.* March, p. 136; Nov. p.  
493). In Yale. There were at least three impressions of the first edition. No  
edition marked the second.

3d ed. London, 1737. In Yale; Dublin, 1743; 4th ed. London, 1751. In  
Yale; London, 1765; 5th ed. London, 1776. In Yale; London, Cawthorne,  
1805, 1806, 1811. In Yale; Morley, *Burlesque Plays*, London, 1887. *German*  
*tr.* Berlin, 1899.

Critical edition: *The Tragedy of Tragedies . . .* edited by James T. Hill-  
house, New Haven, 1918. This contains also the text of the 1st ed. of *Tom*  
*Thumb*, with the additions and the preface of the 2d ed.

THE | LETTER-WRITERS: | Or, a New Way to Keep | A WIFE  
at HOME. | A | FARCE, | In THREE ACTS. | As it is Acted at  
the | THEATRE in the *Hay-Market*. | — | Written by *Scriblerus*  
*Secundus*. | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON, | Printed; and Sold by  
*J. Roberts* in *Warwick-Lane*. | — | MDCCXXXI. | [Price One  
Shilling.]

2 p. l. (Title, Adv., Dramatis Personæ); [5]-48 pp. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ .

First performed March 24, 1731 (*Daily Post*, March 23). Published March  
24, 1731 (*Daily Post*, March 23). In Yale.

London, 1750. In Yale; *Ger. tr.* Mannheim, 1781. In Yale.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE | WELSH OPERA: | OR, THE | *Grey MARE the better HORSE.* | As it is Acted at the | NEW THEATRE | IN THE | *HAY-MARKET.* | — | Written by SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS, | Author of the *Tragedy of Tragedies.* | — | Cobler. *Say, why what d'ye think I say? I say,* | *All men are married for their Sins,* | *And that a Bachelor Cobler,* is happier than a | *Hen-peck'd Prince.* | — | LONDON: | Printed for *E. Rayner*, and sold by *H. Cook*, at the | *Hawk*, near *Water-Lane*, and at the *Golden-Ball*, near | *Chancery-Lane*, both in *Fleet-Street.* | Price One Shilling. | [n. d.]

1 p. l. (Title); ii pp. (Preface); iii pp. (Introduction); [1] p. (Dramatis Personæ); 39 pp.; [1] p. (Adv.)  $7\frac{3}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{16}$ .

First performed April 22, 1731 (*Daily Post*, April 21). Published June, 1731 (*Gent. Mag.* June, p. 272). In Yale. Never reprinted under original title. Revised and published under the two titles which follow.

The GENUINE | **Grub-Street** | OPERA. | As it was intended to be Acted at the | NEW THEATRE | IN THE | *HAY-MARKET.* | — | Written by *Scriblerus Secundus.* | = | Nom. *Hic, haec, hoc.* | Gen. *Hujus.* | Dat. *Huic.* | Acc. *Hunc, hanc, hoc.* | Voc. *Caret.* | — | LONDON: | Printed and Sold for the Benefit of the Comedians of the NEW THEATRE in the *Hay-market.* | MDCCXXXI. | [Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

1 p. l. (Title); iii-vii pp.; [1] p. (Dramatis Personæ); 9-64 pp.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Aug. 18, 1731 (*Grub-st. Journal*, Aug. 19; also *Gent. Mag.* Aug. p. 359). In Bodleian Lib. Never reprinted under this title.

THE | GRUB-STREET | OPERA. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE in the *HAY-MARKET.* | — | By SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS. | — | Sing. Nom. *Hic, Haec, Hoc.* | Gen. *Hujus.* | Dat. *Huic.* | Accus. *Hunc, Hanc, Hoc.* | Voc. *Caret.* Lil. Gram. quod vid. | — | To which is added, | THE | MASQUERADE, | A | POEM. | Printed in MDCCXXVIII. | — | LONDON, | Printed, and sold by J. ROBERTS, in Warwick-lane. | MDCCXXXI. | [Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

4 p. l. (Title, Dramatis Personæ, Introduction); 56 pp.; 1 l.; [2] pp.; 11 pp.  $7\frac{5}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

Published in summer or autumn, 1731. In Yale.

1732

THE | LOTTERY. | A | FARCE. | As it is Acted at the | *Theatre-*  
293

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

*Royal in Drury-Lane, | BY | His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | With the MUSICK prefix'd to each SONG. | — | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields. | — | MDCCXXXII. | [Price One Shilling.]*

4 p. l. (Title, Adv., Prologue, A Table of the Songs, *Dramatis Personæ*); 31 pp.; [1] p. (Epilogue).  $7\frac{1}{16} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ . Contains 19 songs with music.

First performed Jan. 1, 1732 (*Daily Post*, Dec. 31, 1731). Published Jan. 7, 1732 (*Daily Journal*, Jan. 7). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1732; 3d ed. London, 1732. In Yale; London, 1733. In Yale; 4th ed. London, 1748. In Yale; Glasgow, 1758. In Brit. Mus.; Dublin, 1759; 5th ed. London, 1761; Supplement to Bell's British Theatre, v. 2, London, 1784. In Brit. Mus.; London, 1779. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1786. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1792. In Yale.

THE | MODISH COUPLE. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL | In DRURY-LANE. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | [Cut] | — | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields. | — | MDCCXXXII.

4 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable William Lord Harrington," Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 74 pp.; [2] pp. (Epilogue).  $9 \times 5\frac{5}{8}$ .

First performed Jan. 10, 1732 (Genest, *Eng. Stage*, III, p. 329; but the play "as it is acted" is advertised for next week in *Craftsman*, Jan. 8). Published Jan. 15, 1732 (*Craftsman*, Jan. 15). In Yale. The Epilogue only is by Fielding, the play is by Charles Bodens. Epilogue never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

THE | MODERN HUSBAND. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | Written by HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | — | *Hæc ego non credam Venusinâ digna Lucernâ?* | *Hæc ego non agitem?* — | *Cum Leno accipiat Mæchi bona, si capiendi | Jus nullum Uxori, doctus spectare Lacunar, | Doctus & ad Calicem vigilanti stertere Naso.* Juv. Sat. I. | — | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields. | — | MDCCXXXII. [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

4 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable Sir Robert Walpole," Prologue, Epilogue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 81 pp.; [2] pp. (Epilogue); [5] pp. (Adv.)  $8\frac{5}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

First performed Feb. 14, 1732 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 14). Published Feb. 21, 1732 (*Grub-st. Journal*, Feb. 24; also *Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 636). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1732. In Yale; Dublin, 1732. In Yale; Dublin, n. d. In Yale; *Ger. tr.* Strasburg, 1781; Mannheim, n. d.

THE | *Old DEBAUCHEES.* | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | By the Author of the MODERN HUSBAND. | — | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for J. W. And Sold by J. ROBERTS in | *Warwick-Lane*, MDCCXXXII. | [Price One Shilling.]

2 p. l. (Title, Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 40 pp.  $7\frac{5}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

First performed June 1, 1732 (*Daily Post*, June 1). Published June 13, 1732 (*Daily Post*, June 13; also *Gent. Mag.* June, Register of Books, p. 12; *London Mag.* June, p. 162). In Yale, wanting the 2 p. l.

Reprinted under title: *Debauchees*, London, 1745 and 1746. In Yale; 3d ed. 1750. In Yale; 1780. In Yale. Never reprinted, under first title, in Fielding's Works.

THE | *COVENT-GARDEN* | TRAGEDY. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | —quæ amanti parcer, eadem sibi parcer parum. | Quasi piscis, itidem est amator lenæ: nequam est nisi recens. | Is habet succum; is suavitatem; eum quovis pacto condias; | Vel patinarium vel assum: verses, quo pacto lubet. | Is dare volt, is se aliquid posci, nam ubi de pleno promitur, | Neque ille scit, quid det, quid damni faciat; illi rei studet: | Volt placere sese amicæ, volt mihi, pedissequæ, | Volt famulis, volt etiam ancillis: & quoque catulo meo | Subblanditur novus amator, se ut quum videat, gaudeat. | Plautus. Asinar. | — | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS, and Sold by J. ROBERTS | in *Warwick-Lane*. | — | MDCCXXXII. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title); 11 pp.; (Prolegomena, A Criticism on the Covent-Garden Tragedy, originally intended for the Grub-street Journal); [3] pp. (Prologue, Epilogue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 32 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ .

First performed June 1, 1732 (*Daily Post*, June 1). Published June 24, 1732 (*Daily Post*, June 23; also *London Mag.* June, p. 162; *Gent. Mag.* June, Register of Books, p. 13). In Yale.

London, 1754. In Yale; London, 1780, without the Prolegomena. In Yale.

*To Dramaticus, alias Prosaicus, alias Bavius, | alias, &c. &c. &c.*

A letter, written at the "Theatre-Royal Ale-House," signed: "Mr. Wm.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Hint, Candle-Snuffer," published in *The Daily Post*, June 21, 1732; also in *London Evening Post*, June 20-22, 1732.

Probably written by Fielding and Theophilus Cibber in collaboration. Never reprinted. See this biography, vol. I, p. 133.

THE | MOCK DOCTOR. | or | *The DUMB LADY Cur'd.* | A | COMEDY. | Done from *MOLIERE*. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE, | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | *With the MUSICK prefix'd to each SONG.* | — | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields.* | — | MDCCXXXII. [Price One Shilling.]

4 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To Dr. John Misaubin," Preface, A Table of the Songs, *Dramatis Personæ*); 32 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  x  $4\frac{3}{4}$ .

First performed June 23, 1732 (*Daily Post*, June 23). Published July 11, 1732 (*Daily Post*, July 11; also *London Mag.* July, p. 213). Epilogue for the "Mock Doctor," signed: "G." (*Gent. Mag.* Sept. 1740, p. 461). In Brit. Mus.

2d ed., with additional Songs and Alterations, London, 1732. In Yale; London, 1734. In Brit. Mus.; Dublin, 1735; 3d ed. London, 1742. In Yale; Dublin, 1752; 4th ed. London, 1753. In Yale; London, 1760. In Yale; London, 1761. In Yale; Belfast, 1763. In Yale; London, 1779. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1782; Supplement to Bell's British Theatre, vol. I, London, 1784. In Brit. Mus.; Edinburgh, 1786. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1792. In Yale; London, 1794, with Memoir signed "T. B." In Brit. Mus.; Whittingham, 1815. In New York Pub. Lib. Also reprinted in collections of plays.

### To the AUTHOR of the DAILY POST.

A letter signed: "Philalethes," published in *The Daily Post*, July 31, 1732. Never reprinted. See this biography, vol. I, pp. 135-139.

*CÆLIA: OR, THE PERJUR'D LOVER.* | A | PLAY. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE, | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | *Tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri. Hor.* | — | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields.* | — | MDCC-XXXIII. [Price 1 s. and 6 d.]

6 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Adv. to the Reader, Prologue, Epilogue, Adv., *Dramatis Personæ*); 60 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  x  $4\frac{3}{4}$ .

The Epilogue only is by Fielding; the play is by Charles Johnson.

First performed Dec. 11, 1732 (Genest, *Eng. Stage*, III, pp. 363-365). Published Dec. 1732 (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. Register of Books; Adv. is dated: Dec. 8, 1732). In Yale. Epilogue first reprinted in Fielding's Works in 1903.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1733

THE | MISER. | A | COMEDY. | Taken from PLAUTUS and MOLIERE. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE ROYAL in | Drury-Lane, by His Majesty's Servants. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — | *Servorum ventres modio castigat iniquo, | Ipse quoque esu-riens: neque enim omnia sustinet unquam | Mucida cœrulei panis consumere frusta, | Hesternum solitus medio servare minutal | Septembri; nec non differre in tempora cœne | Alterius, conchem æstivi cum parte lacerti | Signatam, vel dimidio putrique siluro, | Filaque sectivi numerata includere porri. | Invitatus ad hæc aliquis de ponte negabit. | Sed quò divitias hæc per tormenta coactas? | Cùm furor haud dubius, cùm sit manifesta phrenesis, | Ut locuples moriaris, egenti vivere fato? Juven.* | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields. | — | MDCCXXXIII. Price 1 s. 6 d.

6 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To His Grace Charles Duke of Richmond and Lenox," Prologue, Epilogue, Adv., Dramatis Personæ); 87 pp.; [1] p. (Adv.) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Adv. is dated March 12, 1733.

First performed Feb. 17, 1733 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 17). Published March 13, 1733 (*Grub-st. Journal*, March 8; also *London Mag.* March, p. 168; *Gent. Mag.* March, pp. 188-189, 163). In Yale.

Edinburgh, 1733. In Yale; Dublin, 1733. In Yale; 2d ed. London, 1744. In Yale; Glasgow, 1748. In Brit. Mus.; 3d ed. London, 1754. In Yale; Glasgow, 1755; 4th ed. London, 1761. In Yale; Dublin, 1762. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1768. In Yale; Glasgow, 1769. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1774, with Life of Fielding. In Philadelphia Lib.; 6th ed. London, 1775, with 1 plate; London, 1792. In Brit. Mus.; London, 1802. In Yale; London [1807], with Life and plate. In Yale; London, 1850. In Brit. Mus.; also in collections of plays. *French tr.* London [1870 ?]

DEBORAH, or a WIFE for You All. Written by HENRY FIELDING for Mrs. CLIVE's benefit, and performed as an afterpiece for the MISER, the 6th of April, 1733. (Genest, *Eng. Stage*, III, p. 371). Never printed.

1734

THE | Intriguing Chambermaid. | A | COMEDY | Of TWO ACTS. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL in Drury-Lane, | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | Taken from the French of REGNARD, | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — | *Majores nusquam ronchi: juvenésque senésque, | Et pueri nasum Rhinocerotis habent.* Martial.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

| — | *LONDON*: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCCXXXIV. | [Price One Shilling.]

6 p. l. (Title, An Epistle to Mrs. Clive, To Mr. Fielding . . . by an unknown Hand, Prologue, Epilogue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 40 pp.  $7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ . Contains 12 Songs with music.

First performed Jan. 15, 1734 (*Daily Journal*, Jan. 15). Published Jan. 1734 (*Gent. Mag.* Jan. p. 55; also *London Mag.* Feb. p. 104). In Yale.

Dublin, 1748; London, 1750. In Yale; Dublin, 1758. In Yale; London, 1761. In Yale; Cork, 1765. In Yale; London, 1776. In Philadelphia Lib.; London, 1780. In Brit. Mus.; Edinburgh, 1783; Altered from Fielding, London, 1790. In Yale; London, Printed for the Proprietors, n. d. In Yale. *Ger. tr.* Mannheim, 1782. In Yale; Mannheim, n. d.

DON QUIXOTE | IN | *ENGLAND*. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | NEW THEATRE in the *Hay-Market*. | — | By *HENRY FIELDING*, Esq; | — | —facile quis | *Speret idem, sudet multum,*  
*frustraque laboret*, | *Ausus idem*— Hor. | = | *LONDON*: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | Wild-Court near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCCXXXIV. | [Price One Shilling and Six Pence.]

8 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable Philip Earl of Chesterfield," Preface, A Table of the Songs, *Dramatis Personæ*, Introduction); 64 pp.  $7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ . Contains 15 songs with music.

First performed in April, 1734 (*Genest, Eng. Stage*, III, p. 434). Published April 18, 1734 (*Grub-st. Journal*, April 18; also *London Mag.* April, pp. 223-224; *Gent. Mag.* April, p. 223). In Yale.

London, 1754; Edinburgh, 1760; London, 1777. In Yale.

1735

AN | OLD MAN taught WISDOM: | OR, THE | VIRGIN UNMASK'D. | A | FARCE. | As it is Perform'd | By His MAJESTY's Company of | COMEDIANS at the THEATRE- | ROYAL in *Drury-Lane*. | — | With the MUSICK prefix'd to each SONG. | = | *LONDON*: | Printed for JOHN WATTS at the Printing-Office | in Wild-Court near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCCXXXV. | Price One Shilling.

2 p. l. (Title, Table of the Songs, *Dramatis Personæ*); 34 pp.; [2] pp. (Song).  $7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{8}$ . Contains 20 songs with music.

First performed Jan. 17, 1735 (*London Evening Post*, Jan. 16-18). Published ca. Jan. 23, 1735 (*Grub-st. Journal*, Jan. 23; also *London Mag.* Jan. p. 52). In Yale.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

2d ed. London, 1735. Contains 12 songs. In Yale; Dublin, 1740. In Brit. Mus.; 3d ed. London, 1742. In Yale; Dublin, 1747. In Yale; 4th ed. London, 1749. In Yale; Glasgow, 1761; Cork, 1762. In Yale; Dublin, 1762; London, 1777. In Brit. Mus.; Edinburgh, 1782; London, 1786. In Yale; London, 1787. In Yale; London, 1791, with 1 plate. In Yale. Sometimes reprinted under its subtitle.

THE | *UNIVERSAL GALLANT*: | OR, THE | DIFFERENT HUSBANDS. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL in Drury-Lane. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | = | *Infelix, habitum temporis hujus habe*. Ovid. | — | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN WATTS, at the Printing-Office in *Wild-Court*, near *Lincolns-Inn-Fields* | — | MDCCXXXV. | [Price One Shilling and Six Pence.]

4 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To His Grace Charles Duke of Marlborough," Adv., Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 82 pp.; [2] pp. (Epilogue).  $7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ .

First performed Feb. 10, 1735, and published a few days later (*Fog's Weekly Journal*, Feb. 8; also *London Mag.* Feb. p. 104; *Gent. Mag.* Feb. pp. 88-89; *Prompter*, Feb. 18). In Yale. No other separate edition.

### 1736

PASQUIN. | A DRAMATICK | SATIRE on the TIMES: | BEING THE | REHEARSAL of Two PLAYS, *viz.* | A COMEDY call'd, | THE ELECTION; | And a TRAGEDY call'd, | *The LIFE and DEATH of COMMON-SENSE*. | As it is Acted at the THEATRE in the | HAY-MARKET. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCCXXXVI. | [Price One Shilling and Six Pence.]

2 p. l. (Title, Adv., *Dramatis Personæ*); 64 pp.; [4] pp. (Epilogue, Adv.)  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{8}$ .

First performed March 5, 1736 (*London Daily Post*, March 5). Published April 8, 1736 (*London Daily Post*, April 6 and 7; also *Grub-st. Journal*, April 8; *Gent. Mag.* April, p. 235; *London Mag.* April, p. 224). In Yale.

Dublin, 1736. In Yale; "The Tenth ed." London, 1737. In Yale; London, 1738; 2d ed. London, 1740. Published Oct. 13, 1740 (*Champion*, Oct. 11). In Yale; 3d ed. London, 1754. In Yale.

TUMBLE-DOWN DICK: | OR, | PHAETON in the SUDS. | A | Dramatick Entertainment of Walking, | in Serious and Foolish Characters: | Interlarded with | Burlesque, Grotesque, Comick

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Interludes, | CALL'D, | HARLEQUIN A PICK-POCKET. | As it is Perform'd at the | New Theatre *in the Hay-Market.* | Being ('tis hop'd) the last Entertainment that will | ever be exhibited on any Stage. | Invented by the Ingenious | MONSIEUR SANS ESPRIT. | The Musick compos'd by the Harmonious | SIGNIOR WARBLERINI. | And the Scenes painted by the Prodigious | MYNHEER VAN BOTTOM-FLAT. | — | *Monstr' horrend' inform.— | — |* LONDON: | Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields.* | MDCCXXXVI. | [Price Six Pence.]

4 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To Mr. John Lun, Vulgarly call'd Esquire," signed "Pasquin," The Argument, *Dramatis Personæ*); 19 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{7}{8}$ .

First performed April 29, 1736 (*London Daily Post*, April 28). Published April 29, 1736 (*London Evening Post*, April 29-May 1). In Yale; Bodleian Lib.

Apparently the rarest of all the plays. No other copies known than the one at Yale and the one at the Bodleian Lib.

London, 1744. In Yale; Brit. Mus.

FATAL CURIOSITY: | A TRUE | TRAGEDY | OF | THREE ACTS. | As it is Acted at the | NEW THEATRE | IN THE | HAY-MARKET. | By Mr. LILLO. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN GRAY at the *Cross-Keys* in the | *Poultry* near *Cheapside.* MDCCXXXVII. | [Price One Shilling.]

2 p. l. (Title, Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); [5]-47 pp.; [1] p. (Adv.)  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

First performed under title: *Guilt its own Punishment; or, Fatal Curiosity*, May 27, 1736 (*London Daily Post*, May 27). Published *ca.* April 5, 1737 (*London Evening Post*, April 5-7; also *Gent. Mag.* April, p. 256; *London Mag.* April, p. 224). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1762. In Yale; London, 1780, with portrait of Mrs. Yates. In Yale; London, 1796, with portrait of C. Kemble. In Yale.

Fielding revised the play, and wrote the Prologue. The Prologue never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

1737

EURYDICE, | A | FARCE: | As it was d—mned | AT THE | THEATRE-ROYAL | in DRURY-LANE.

First performed under title: *Euridice, or The Devil Henpeck'd*, Feb. 19, 1737 (*London Daily Post*, Feb. 19). Published in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. II, pp. 251-290. In Yale. Apparently never printed before 1743.

Ger. tr. Mannheim, 1790.

*TUMBLE-DOWN DICK:*  
O R,  
*PHAETON in the SUDS.*

A

Dramatick Entertainment of Walking,  
in Serious and Foolish Characters:

Interlarded with  
Burlesque, Grotesque, Comick Interludes,

CALL'D,

*HARLEQUIN A PICK-POCKET.*

As it is Perform'd at the  
New Theatre *in the Hay-Market.*

Being ('tis hop'd) the last Entertainment that will  
ever be exhibited on any Stage.

Invented by the Ingenious  
*MONSIEUR SANS ESPRIT.*

The Musick compos'd by the Harmonious  
*SIGNIOR WARBLERINI.*

And the Scenes painted by the Prodigious  
*MYNHEER VAN BOTTOM-FLAT.*

---

*Monstr' horrend' inform. —*

---

*L O N D O N :*

Printed for J. WATTS at the Printing-Office in  
*Wild-Court near Lincoln's-Inn Fields.*

M D C C X X X V I .

[ Price Six Pence. ]



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE | HISTORICAL REGISTER | For the Year 1736. | As it is Acted at the | NEW THEATRE | In the HAY-MARKET. | To which is added a very merry TRAGEDY, called, | EURYDICE HISS'D, | OR, | A Word to the Wise. | Both written by the Author of *Pasquin*. | To these are prefixed a long *Dedication to the | Publick*, and a *Preface to that Dedication*. | — | [Cut] | — | LONDON, | Printed: And Sold by *J. Roberts*, near the *Ox- | ford-Arms-Inn* in *Warwick-Lane*. | [n. d.]

7 p. l. (Title, Preface to the Dedication, Dedication to the Publick, Dramatis Personæ); 41 pp.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ .

*The Historical Register* (pp. 1-27) first performed *ca. April 1, 1737* (*Grub-st. Journal*, April 7; also *London Evening Post*, April 7-9). *Eurydice Hiss'd* (pp. 29-41) first performed April 13, 1737 (*Grub-st. Journal*, April 7; also *London Evening Post*, April 7-9). Published together May 12, 1737 (*Grub-st. Journal*, May 12; also *London Evening Post*, May 12; *London Mag.* May, p. 279; *Gent. Mag.* June, p. 374). In Yale.

THE | HISTORICAL REGISTER | For the YEAR 1736. | As it is Acted at the | NEW THEATRE | In the HAY-MARKET. | To which is added a very Merry TRAGEDY, called | EURYDICE HISS'D, | OR, | A WORD to the WISE. | Both written by the Author of *Pasquin*. | To these are prefixed a long *Dedication to the | Publick*, and a *Preface to that Dedication*. | = | LONDON, | Printed: And sold by *J. Roberts* near the *Oxford- | Arms-Inn* in *Warwick-Lane*. | [Price 1 s. 6 d.] [n. d.]

8 p. l. (Title, Preface to the Dedication, Dedication to the Publick, Dramatis Personæ); 48 pp.  $7\frac{1}{16} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

The 2d edition, though not so named, with many alterations. In Yale.

Dublin, Jones, 1737; Dublin, Risk, 1737. In Yale; London, 1741. In Yale; 3d ed. London, 1744. In Yale; *Eurydice Hissed*, New York, 1817.

*To the Author of the Gazetteer of May 7.*

A letter signed: "Pasquin," published in *Common Sense*, no. 15, May 21, 1737, with an introductory letter To the Author of *COMMON SENSE*.

Reprinted in *Common Sense: or, The Englishman's Journal*, London, 1738, vol. I, pp. 114-118; also in *London Magazine*, May 1737, pp. 261-262. Never reprinted in *Fielding's Works*.

Probably Fielding contributed other articles to *Common Sense*; see especially those on the nature of humour for September 3 and 10, 1737.

Numerous playbills, especially during the years 1736-1737 while Fielding was manager of the Little Theatre in the Hay-Market.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

No collection of them known to exist; but many of them were reprinted as advertisements in the newspapers.

1739-1741

THE | CHAMPION; | [Cut: Hercules slaying the Hydra] | OR, | BRITISH | MERCURY. | — | By Capt. HERCULES VINEGAR, of Hockley in the Hole. | THURSDAY, November 15, 1739. | (To be continued every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday Morning.)

This is probably the first title of *The Champion*, but no number earlier than no. 64, April 10, 1740, is known to exist. Advertised in the *London Daily Post*, Nov. 12, 1739, as follows: "On Thursday next will be published for the first time, | (To be continued every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday | Morning) | THE CHAMPION; or, BRITISH MERCURY. | By the celebrated CAPT. HERCULES VINEGAR, of | Hockley in the Hole. | Containing Essays on various Subjects, and the | freshest Advices, both Foreign and Domestick. | —Quod optanti Divum promittere nemo | Auderet volvenda dies en attulit. VIRG. | Printed for T. COOPER at the *Globe* in *Pater-noster-Row*."

The following is the title of the earliest number known:

THE | CHAMPION; | [Cut: Hercules slaying the Hydra] | OR, | EVENING | ADVERTISER. | — | By Capt. HERCULES VINEGAR, of Pall-Mall. | THURSDAY, April 10, 1740. | (To be continued every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday Evening.)

At bottom of first page is: [Price Three Half-pence.]

Subsequently title-page varies.

4 pp. Printed page: 12 $\frac{5}{8}$  x 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ ; including margin: 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 10.

Colophon: LONDON: Printed for J. GRAHAM, under the *Inner Temple Gate*, opposite *Chancery Lane*, in *Fleetstreet*; where Advertisements | and Letters to the AUTHOR are taken in.

Fielding contributed to this paper from its founding to June, 1741 (*Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, pp. xxxiv, xxxvi).

Originals of no. 64 to no. 158: April 10, 1740, to Nov. 15, 1740, in Bodleian Lib. Sept. 2, 1740, March 24, 1741, and May 19, 1741, in Brit. Mus. June 10, 1740, June 12, 1740, Oct. 11, 1740, and May 7, 1741, in New York Pub. Lib.

Essays from Nov. 15, 1739, to June 19, 1740, published London, 1741, 1743, and 1766. Numerous later essays reprinted in *The Patriot*, a weekly periodical, Edinburgh, June 13-Nov. 14, 1740; which was published as a single volume, Edinburgh, 1741. Essays for April 22, 29, May 6 and 17, 1740, were reprinted in *The Tryal of Colley Cibber*, London, 1740, pp. 3-37. Fielding's contributions after June 19, 1740, have never been collected.

1741

OF | TRUE GREATNESS. | An EPISTLE to | The Right Honour-  
302

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

able | GEORGE DODINGTON, Esq.; | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for C. CORBET, at *Addison's Head* against St. Dunstan's | Church, in *Fleet street*. 1741. | [Price One Shilling.]

2 p. l. (Title, Preface); 4-16 pp.  $12\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ .

Published Jan. 7, 1741 (*London Daily Post*, Jan. 7; also *Gent. Mag.* Jan. p. 56; *London Mag.* Jan. p. 52). In Bodleian Lib. No other copy known to exist.

Reprinted in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, pp. 1-14; first published in Fielding's Works, London, 1872, vol. XI, pp. 99-110.

ΤΗΣ | ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΒΕΡΝΟΝΙΑΔΟΣ, | ΡΑΨΩΔΙΑ ἢ ΓΡΑΜΜΑ Α' | — | THE | VERNON-IAD. | DONE into ENGLISH, | From the original GREEK | of | HOMER. | Lately found at CONSTANTINOPLE. | WITH | NOTES in usum, &c. | — | BOOK THE FIRST. | = | LONDON: | Printed for CHARLES CORBETT, at *Addison's Head* | against St. Dunstan's Church; *Fleet-street*. | — | MDCCXLI. | [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

1 p. l. (Title); 37 pp.  $8\frac{15}{16} \times 7$ .

Published Jan. 22, 1741 (*London Daily Post*, Jan. 22; also *Craftsman*, Jan. 24; *Gent. Mag.* Jan. p. 56; *London Mag.* Jan. p. 52). In Yale.

Dublin, 1741. First published in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XV, pp. 35-60.

AN | APOLOGY | FOR THE LIFE | OF | Mrs. SHAMELA ANDREWS. | In which, the many notorious FALSHOODS and | MISREPRESENTATIONS of a Book called | PAMELA, | Are exposed and refuted; and all the matchless | ARTS of that young Politician, set in a true and | just Light. | Together with | A full Account of all that passed between her | and Parson Arthur Williams; whose Character | is represented in a manner something different | from what he bears in PAMELA. The | whole being exact Copies of authentick Papers | delivered to the Editor. | — | Necessary to be had in all FAMILIES. | — | By Mr. CONNY KEYBER. | — | LONDON: | Printed for A. DODD, at the Peacock, without *Temple-bar*. | M.DCC.XLI.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); v-xv pp. (Dedication: "To Miss Fanny, &c." Letters to the Editor); 59 pp.  $7\frac{3}{16} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published April 4, 1741 (*Craftsman*, April 4; also *Gent. Mag.* April, p. 224; *London Mag.* April, p. 208). In Yale. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

AN | APOLOGY | FOR THE | LIFE | OF | Mrs. SHAMELA ANDREWS.  
| In which, the many notorious FALSHOODS and | MISREPRSENTA-  
TIONS of a Book called | *PAMELA*, | Are exposed and refuted; and  
all the matchless | ARTS of that young Politician, set in a true and |  
just Light | Together with | A full Account of all that passed  
between her | and Parson *Arthur Williams*; whose Character is |  
represented in a manner something different from | that which he  
bears in *PAMELA*. The | whole being exact Copies of authentick  
Papers | delivered to the Editor. | — | Necessary to be had in all  
FAMILIES. | — | By Mr. CONNY KEYBER. | = | *LONDON*: |  
Printed for A. DODD, at the *Peacock*, without *Temple-bar*. |  
M.DCC.XLI.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); v-xv pp. (Dedication: "To Miss Fanny, &c.,"  
Letters to the Editor); 56 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Nov. 3, 1741 (*Champion*, Nov. 3). This is the second edition,  
though not so called on the title-page. Variations in title and in text; but  
"Misrepresentations" is misspelled in both titles. In Yale. Never reprinted  
in Fielding's Works.

THE | CRISIS: | A | SERMON, | ON | Revel. XIV. 9, 10, 11. |  
Necessary to be preached in all the Churches | in *England, Wales*,  
and *Berwick* upon | *Tweed*, at or before the next | GENERAL  
ELECTION. | Humbly inscribed to the | Right Reverend the Bench  
of BISHOPS. | — | By a Lover of his Country. | — | *Vendidit hic*  
*auro Patriam. Virg.* | = | *LONDON*: | Printed for A. DODD, with-  
out *Temple-Bar*; E. NUTT, | at the *Royal-Exchange*, and H. CHAP-  
PELLE, in | *Grosvenor-Street*. MDCCXLI. | (Price Six-pence.)

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 20 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

Published April, 1741 (*Gent. Mag.* April, p. 224; also *London Mag.* April,  
p. 208). In Yale; Harvard.

2d ed. Price Three Pence. Advertised in *The Plain Truth*, 1741.

Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

THE | CHAMPION: | CONTAINING | A SERIES of PAPERS, |  
HUMOROUS, MORAL, POLITICAL, | and CRITICAL. | To each of which  
is added, | A proper Index to the Times. | — | *Quem legis ut nōris,*  
*accipe.* OVID. | — | VOL. I. [II.] | [Cut] | = | *LONDON*: | Printed  
for J. HUGGONSON, in *Sword and Buckler* | *Court*, over-against the  
*Crown-Tavern* on *Ludgate- Hill*. | MDCCXLI.

THE  
C R I S I S:  
A  
S E R M O N,  
O N  
REVEL. XIV. 9, 10, 11.

Necessary to be preached in all the Churches  
in *England, Wales, and Berwick upon*  
*Tweed*, at or before the next

GENERAL ELECTION.

Humbly inscribed to the  
Right Reverend the Bench of BISHOPS.

---

By a Lover of his Country.

---

*Vendidit hic auro Patriam.*      Virg.

---

*L O N D O N:*

Printed for A. DODD, without *Temple-Bar*; E. NUTT,  
at the *Royal-Exchange*, and H. CHAPPELLE, in  
*Grosvenor-Street*. MDCCXLI.

(Price Six-pence.)



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); x pp.; 360 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 360 pp. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ .

Contains papers from Nov. 15, 1739, to June 19, 1740, of which more than seventy were by Fielding.

Published June, 1741 (*London Mag.* June, 1741, p. 312; also *Gent. Mag.* June 19, 1741, p. 336). In Yale.

2d ed., "With the addition of a large Table of Contents in each Volume." London, Printed for H. Chappelle, at Sir Isaac Newton's Head, in Grosvenor-Street, M.DCC.XLIII. In Yale; 3d ed., Printed for T. Waller, opposite Fetter-Lane, Fleet-Street, M.DCC.LXVI. In Brit. Mus. Both these editions are the first, with new title-pages and index.

First published in part in Fielding's Works, ed. by Leslie Stephen, London, 1882; republished from Stephen in Works, New York, 1903. Derived from the reprint of 1741.

### 1742

THE | OPPOSITION. | A | VISION. | — | *Heu Patria! heu Plebes  
Scelerata, & prava | favoris!* SIL. ITALICUS. | *Audi alteram Partem.*  
| — | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for T. COOPER, at the *Globe*  
in | *Pater-noster-Row.* 1742. | [Price six-pence.]

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 25 pp. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Dec. 1741 (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. p. 670; also *London Mag.* Dec. p. 624). In Yale. First reprinted in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XIV, pp. 321-331.

THE | HISTORY | OF THE | ADVENTURES | OF | JOSEPH  
ANDREWS, | And of his FRIEND | Mr. ABRAHAM ADAMS. |  
Written in Imitation of | The *Manner* of CERVANTES, | Author of  
*Don Quixote.* | — | IN TWO VOLUMES. | — | VOL. I. [II.] | — |  
LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, over-against | *St. Clement's  
Church*, in the *Strand*. | M.DCC.XLII.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xix, [1] pp. (Preface, Errors); 306 i.e. 308 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 310 pp.; [3] pp. (Books printed for A. Millar). 6 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 3 $\frac{13}{16}$ . Copies differ as to pages of advertisements. "In two volumes" not included in title of vol. II.

Published Feb. 22, 1742 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 22; also *Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 112; *London Mag.* Feb. p. 104). 1500 copies printed. In Yale.

The SECOND EDITION: | Revised and Corrected with *Alterations*  
and | *Additions* by the AUTHOR. | — | IN TWO VOLUMES. | — |  
VOL. I. [II.] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, over-  
against | *St. Clement's Church*, in the *Strand*. | M.DCC.XLII.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xxii pp. (Preface, Contents); [2] pp. (Books printed for A. Millar); 308 pp.; [1] p. (Books Printed for and Sold by A. Millar); [3] pp. (Books printed for A. Millar). Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-vii pp. (Contents); 304 pp.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{8}$ . "In two volumes" not included in title of vol. II.

Published August, 1742 (*Gent. Mag.* Aug. p. 448; also *London Mag.* Aug. p. 416). 2000 copies printed. In Yale.

The THIRD EDITION, illustrated with CUTS. | — | IN TWO VOLUMES. | — | VOL. I. [II.] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to *Katharine Street*, in the *Strand*. | M.DCC.XLIII.

Vol. I: 10 p. l. (Title, Preface, Contents); 226 pp.; [2] pp. (Books printed for A. Millar). 5 plates. Vol. II: 3 p. l. (Title, Contents); 226 pp. 7 plates.  $6\frac{5}{8} \times 4$ . "In two volumes" not included in title of vol. II. This is the first edition with plates.

Published March 24, 1743 (*St. James Evening Post*, March 22-24; also *Gent. Mag.* March, p. 168). 3000 copies printed. In Yale.

Other editions, British and foreign: Dublin, 1742; Londres, 1743; Amsterdam, 1744. In Yale; Danzig, 1745; Berlin, 1746; Dublin, 1747. In Yale; 4th ed. Published Nov. 5, 1748, dated 1749. In Yale; Kjobenhavn, 1749. In Yale; Londres, 1750. In Brit. Mus.; 5th ed. London, 1751. In Yale; London, 1752; Venezia, 1753; 6th ed. London, 1762. In Yale; Amsterdam, 1764; Berlin, 1765. In Yale; 8th ed. London, 1768. In Yale; 9th ed. London, 1769. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1770. In Yale; Berlin, 1770; Amsterdam, 1775. In Morgan Lib.; Berlin, 1776; Abridged, Newbery [1778 ?]; London, 1778; Paris, 1779. In Yale; London, 1780. In Yale; 10th ed. London, 1781. In Yale; London, 1781. In Yale; Dresden, 1783. In Yale; London, 1783; Reims, 1784. In Yale; Berlin, 1784; Frankfurth und Leipzig, 1784; London [1785 ?]; London, 1785. In Yale; Berlin, 1786; Lipskar, 1787; London, 1788; London, 1790. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1791; Göttingen, 1792; Edinburgh, 1792. In Yale; Leith, 1792. In Yale; London, [1793]. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1794; London, [1794]. In Yale; Meissen, 1802; Edinburgh, 1805. In Yale; London, 1808. In Yale; London, 1809. London, 1810. In Yale; Meissen, 1811; London, 1815. In Yale; New York, 1816; London, 1818. In Yale; London, 1820. In Yale; London, 1822. In Yale; London, 1823. In Yale; London, 1825. In Yale; London, 1832. In Yale; London, 1833; London, 1834; Paris, 1834. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1836; Braunschweig, 1840. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1847; Braunschweig, 1848; New York, 1852. In Lib. Cong.; Philadelphia, 1853; New York, 1857. In Yale; New York, 1861. In Yale; London, 1876. In Yale; London, 1882. In Yale; London, 1885. In Yale; London, 1889; London, 1902; New York, 1902. In Yale; New York, 1903; Abridged, London, 1904; New York, 1905. In Yale; London, ca. 1905. In Yale; London, 1906. In Yale; London, 1910. In Yale; London, 1913. In Yale.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

A FULL | VINDICATION | OF THE | DUTCHESS DOWAGER | OF | MARLBOROUGH: | BOTH | With regard to the ACCOUNT lately | Published by | HER GRACE, | AND to | Her CHARACTER in general; | AGAINST | The *base* and *malicious* Invectives contained | in a late *scurrilous* Pamphlet, entitled | REMARKS on the Account, &c. | — | In a Letter to the NOBLE AUTHOR | of those *Remarks*. | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. ROBERTS, in *Warwick-Lane*. | M.DCC.XLII.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 40 pp.  $7\frac{1}{16} \times 4\frac{7}{8}$ .

Published April, 1742 (*Gent. Mag.* April, p. 224; also *London Mag.* April, p. 208). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1742. In Yale.

First published in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XV, pp. 5-34.

MISS LUCY | IN TOWN. | A | SEQUEL | TO | *The Virgin Unmasqued*. | A | FARCE; | WITH SONGS. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL | In DRURY-LANE, | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, against St. Clement's | Church in the *Strand*. 1742. | (Price One Shilling.)

2 p. l. (Title, A Table of the Songs, *Dramatis Personæ*); 44 pp.  $8\frac{1}{16} \times 4\frac{15}{16}$ .

First performed May 6, 1742 (*Daily Post*, May 6). Published May 6, 1742 (*Daily Post*, May 6; also *Champion*, May 6; *Gent. Mag.* May, p. 280). In Yale.

“In which I had a very small share” (*Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, p. xxvii *i.e.* xxxvii).

2d ed. London, 1756. In Yale; 3d ed. London, 1764. In Yale.

PLUTUS, | THE | GOD of RICHES. | A | COMEDY. | Translated from the Original *Greek* of | ARISTOPHANES: | With Large NOTES Explanatory and | Critical. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | AND | The Revd. Mr. YOUNG. | = | LONDON: | Printed for T. WALLER in the *Temple-Cloisters*. | — | MDCCXLII. [Price 2 s.]

4 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Dedication: “To the Right Honourable the Lord Talbot”); [v]-xv pp. (Preface); [1] p. (*Dramatis Personæ*); 112 pp.  $8\frac{5}{8} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ .

Published May 31, 1742 (*Champion*, May 29; *Daily Post*, May 31; also *London Mag.* June, p. 312; *Gent. Mag.* June, p. 336). In Yale.

Included in *Comedies of Aristophanes*, London, 1812, pp. 115-267. In Yale. Dedication and Preface first published in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XVI, pp. 53-64.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1743

SOME | PAPERS | Proper to Read before the | Royal Society, | Concerning the | Terrestrial Chrysipus, | GOLDEN-FOOT or GUINEA; | AN | INSECT, or VEGETABLE, resem- | bling the Polypus, which hath this sur- | prising Property, That being cut into several | Pieces, each Piece becomes a perfect Animal, | or Vegetable, as complete as that of which it | was originally only a Part. | — | Collected | By PETRUS GUALTERUS, | But not Published till after His Death. | LONDON: | Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford Arms*, | in *Warwick-Lane*. 1743. | [Price Sixpence.]

3 p. l. (Title, 2d title, Contents, Abstract of Part of a Letter from the Heer Rottenschraach); 7-31 pp. 8vo.

Published Feb. 16, 1743 (*Daily Post*, Feb. 16; also *London Mag.* Feb. p. 104). In Brit. Mus.

Reprinted, with the addition of a Postscript, in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, pp. 252-277.

THE | WEDDING-DAY. | A | COMEDY, | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL | IN | DRURY-LANE, | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — | [Cut] | — | LONDON, | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to *Catharine-Street* in the *Strand*. MDCCXLIII. | [Price One Shilling and Six Pence.]

2 p. l. (Title, Dramatis Personæ, Prologue); 82 pp.; [2] pp. (Epilogue). 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{16}$ .

First performed Feb. 17, 1743 (*London Daily Post*, Feb. 17). Published Feb. 1743 (*Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 112; also *London Mag.* Feb. p. 104). In Yale.

Printed more than once in 1743, but not reset. Yale copy has all the printer's errors, and hence it is the earliest.

Published in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. II, pp. 291-420, 1 l. *Ger. tr.* Copenhagen, 1759, with *Eurydice*; Berlin u. Leipzig, 1764; Mannheim, 1781.

MISCELLANIES, | BY | *Henry Fielding* Esq; | In THREE VOLUMES. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for the AUTHOR: | And sold by A. MILLAR, opposite to | *Catharine-Street*, in the *Strand*. | MDCCXLIII.

13 p. l. (Title, 2d Title, List of Subscribers); xxvii *i.e.* xxxvii pp. (Preface); 354 pp. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{16}$  x 5, large paper 8 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

2d title gives VOL. I. in the place of In THREE VOLUMES, and the cut varies. 427 subscribers take 214 Royal sets, and 342 in 8vo.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

MISCELLANIES, | BY | *Henry Fielding* Esq; | — | VOL. II.  
A JOURNEY from this | WORLD to the Next, &c. | [Cut] |  
LONDON: | Printed for the AUTHOR: | And sold by A. MILLAR,  
opposite to | *Catharine-Street*, in the *Strand*. | MDCCXLIII.

1 p. l. (Title); 420 pp.; 2 pp. (Epilogue).

MISCELLANIES. | — | THE | LIFE | OF | Mr. JONATHAN  
WILD | THE GREAT. | — | VOL. III. | — | By HENRY FIELDING,  
Esq; | = | LONDON, | Printed for the AUTHOR; and sold by  
A. MILLAR, opposite to *Catharine-street* in the *Strand*. | — |  
MDCCXLIII.

5 p. l. (Title, Contents); 421 pp.

Published April 12, 1743 (*London Daily Post*, April 12). Subscribers had been receiving copies during the previous week (*London Daily Post*, April 7; and *St. James's Evening Post*, March 26-29, where the volumes are advertised for delivery to subscribers on April 7). In Yale.

The SECOND EDITION. | [Cut] | LONDON: Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to | *Catharine-Street* in the *Strand*. | MDCCXLIII.

8 x 5.

The 2d vol. of this edition is often mistaken for the first edition, as the words, "The Second Edition," are omitted; but the first edition was printed for the Author, the second edition was printed for A. Millar.

Published April, 1743 (*London Mag.* April, p. 208). In Yale.

Dublin, 1743. Second vol. only in Yale. The matter in the *Miscellanies* was gradually reprinted in Fielding's Works, but not until 1872 was all included.

1744

THE | ADVENTURES | OF | DAVID SIMPLE: | Containing |  
An ACCOUNT of his TRAVELS | Through the | CITIES of LONDON  
and | WESTMINSTER, | In the Search of | A REAL FRIEND.  
| — | By a LADY. | IN TWO VOLUMES. | VOL. I. [II.] | — |  
THE SECOND EDITION, | *Revised and Corrected*. | With a PREFACE |  
By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR,  
opposite *Katharine- street*, in the *Strand*. | — | M.DCC.XLIV.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xx pp. (The Preface, Books printed for A. Millar, Contents); 278 pp.; [2] pp. (Books printed for A. Millar). Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 322 pp. 6 $\frac{3}{8}$  x 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ . "In two volumes" not included in title of vol. II.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Published after May, 1744, probably in the autumn. In Yale.

Fielding not only wrote the Preface but he also revised the text of this novel by his sister Sarah. The Preface is not in the first edition.

London, 1782. In Yale; Reims, 1784; London, 1904. In Yale.

1745

A SERIOUS | ADDRESS | TO THE | People of GREAT BRITAIN. | In which the | CERTAIN CONSEQUENCES | OF THE | PRESENT REBELLION, | Are fully demonstrated. | Necessary to be perused by every LOVER | of his Country, at this Juncture. | — | [7 lines of quotation] | SAL. BEL. CATALIN. | — | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER at the *Globe* in Pater-noster- | Row. MDCCXLV. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title); 45 pp.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Oct. 1745 (*Gent. Mag.* Oct. p. 560; also *London Mag.* Nov. p. 572). In Yale.

In a note in *A Proper Answer to a Late Scurrilous Libel*, 1747, Fielding writes: "See the Serious address published in the time of the late Rebellion, and The Dialogue between an Alderman and a Courtier, published last Summer; both by the Author of this Pamphlet." See also *The Certain Consequences of the Rebellion in 1745* listed by Millar in the 2d ed. of Sarah Fielding's *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 1758, as by Henry Fielding. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

A SERIOUS | ADDRESS | To the PEOPLE of | GREAT BRITAIN. | In which the | Certain CONSEQUENCES of the | PRESENT REBELLION, | Are fully demonstrated. | Necessary to be perused by every LOVER of | his COUNTRY, at this Juncture. | — | The SECOND EDITION Corrected, with Additions. | — | [7 lines of quotation] | SAL. BEL. CATALIN. | = | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in Pater-noster- | Row. MDCCXLV. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title); 3-40 pp. (A Serious address to the People of Great Britain); 41-51 pp. (A Calm address to all Parties in Religion).  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Nov. 5, 1745 (*True Patriot*, Nov. 5). In Yale. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

The History of the Present Rebellion in Scotland. London: COOPER, 1745.

Published Oct. 1745 (*London Mag.* Nov. p. 571; also *Gent. Mag.* Oct. p. 560; *Scots Mag.* Oct. p. 495; *Notes and Queries*, Jan. 7, 1888, 7th ser., vol. V, p. 1).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Quoted in Millar's list in the 2d ed. of Sarah Fielding's *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 1758, as by Henry Fielding. No copy known. On the probable relation of this pamphlet to *A Compleat and Authentick History . . . of the late Rebellion*, see this biography, vol. II, pp. 56-57 note.

THE | DEBAUCHEES: | OR, THE | JESUIT CAUGHT. | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL in *Drury-Lane*. | By His MAJESTY's Servants. | — | By *HENRY FIELDING*, Esq; | = | LONDON: | Printed by and for J. WATTS: and Sold by him at the | Printing-Office in *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*; and | by W. REEVE at *Shakespear's Head, Serjeants-Inn Gate*, | *Fleetstreet*. M DCC XLV. | [Price One Shilling.]

2 p. l. (Title, Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); [5]-46 pp.; [2] pp. (Advertisements, dated Oct. 28, 1745).

Published Oct. 1745 (*Gent. Mag.* Oct. p. 560; also *London Mag.* Nov. p. 571. In *Brit. Mus.*

2d ed. London, 1746. In Yale; 3d ed. London, 1750. In Yale; London, 1780. In Yale. See *The Old Debauchees*, 1732.

THE DRAMATICK | WORKS | OF | *HENRY FIELDING*, Esq; | IN TWO VOLUMES. | VOLUME *the FIRST*. | CONTAINING, | Love in several MASQUES. | The Intriguing CHAMBER- | MAID. | The MISER. | The MODERN HUSBAND. | The LOTTERY. | The VIRGIN Unmask'd. | The UNIVERSAL GAL- | LANT. | DON QUIXOTE in *England*. | The COFFEE-HOUSE Po- | LITICIAN. | = | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*.

THE DRAMATICK | WORKS | OF | *HENRY FIELDING*, Esq; | VOLUME *the SECOND*. | CONTAINING, | The AUTHOR'S FARCE. | The TEMPLE BEAU. | The TRAGEDY of TRAGEDIES. | The LETTER-WRITERS; | or, A New Way to keep | a Wife at Home. | The OLD DEBAUCHEES. | The MOCK DOCTOR; or, | The Dumb Lady Cur'd. | PASQUIN: A Dramatick | Satyr on the Times. | The COVENT-GARDEN | TRAGEDY. | TUMBLE-DOWN DICK; or, | *Phaeton* in the Suds. | The HISTORICAL REGI- | STER for the Year 1736. | EURYDICE HISS'D; or, A | Word to the Wise. | = | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*.

7 7/8 x 4 3/4.

Published Oct. 28, 1745 (Adv.). In Yale.

The plays are of different dates and editions, and vary in every set. Issued

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

with the same title for several years. Millar published a similar set in 1755, but that set has a play dated 1761. In Yale.

Dramatic Works, London: 1783. 4 vols. being vols. I-IV, of Works of that year, with new title-pages.

A | DIALOGUE | BETWEEN | THE DEVIL, the POPE, | and THE | PRETENDER. | —*Comes additur una | Hortator Scelerum.* | Virgil. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noster-Row.* | MDCCXLV.

2 p. l.; 5-44 pp. 8vo.

Published Nov. 5, 1745 (*True Patriot*, Nov. 5). In Brit. Mus.

Advertised by Millar as by Fielding in 2d ed. of *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 1758; it is advertised in *True Patriot*, no. 4, Nov. 26, 1745, with *A Serious Address*, and the statement is added: "Both by the same Author." Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

1745-1746

NUMB. 1 [-33.] | The TRUE PATRIOT: | AND | The History of Our Own Times. | (To be Continued Every TUESDAY.) | — | TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1745. [-JUNE, 17, 1746.]

At bottom of first page: [Price THREE-PENCE.]

4 pp. Printed page: 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ ; with margin: 15 x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Colophon for no. 1: LONDON: Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-Noster-Row*; where Advertisements and Letters to | the AUTHOR are taken in.

Colophon for no. 2: LONDON: Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-Noster-Row*; where Advertisements and Letters to | the AUTHOR are taken in. Where may be had, No. I, containing an *Introductory Essay*, an *Apology for Scotland*, | a *New Loyal Song*, the *History of Europe, Great Britain, &c.*

Colophon for no. 3 adds to the above: And No. II. containing *An Essay on Patriotism, an Apology for Roman Catholics, &c.*

Colophon for nos. 4-18 changes to: Where may be had the former Numbers.

Colophon for nos. 19-32: LONDON: Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-Noster-Row*; and Sold by GEORGE WOODFALL, near | *Craig's Court, Charing-Cross.* At both which Places Advertisements, and Letters to the AUTHOR are taken in. | Where may be had the former Numbers.

No. 13 substitutes for the words, "To be Continued Every Tuesday," the words, "From Tuesday, January 21, to Tuesday, January 28, 1746"; and so to the last.

Brit. Mus. has nos. 1-32; photographs of these in Yale.

Extracts from nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29 in *Gent. Mag.* Dec. 1745, Jan., March, April, and May, 1746; from nos. 10, 14, 27, 28, 31 and 33 in *London Mag.* Jan., Feb., May, and June, 1746.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Essays from nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 23 and 24 reprinted in Fielding's Works, London, 1762, vol. III, pp. 561-591. Fielding's contributions as a whole have never been collected.

1746

THE FEMALE HUSBAND; or, the Surprising History of Mrs. MARY, alias Mr. GEORGE HAMILTON, convicted for Marrying a young Woman of WELLS. LONDON: M. COOPER, 1746.

Published Nov. 1746 (*Gent. Mag.* Nov. p. 616; also *London Mag.* Nov. p. 594; *Scots Mag.* Nov. p. 551).

No copy known. Included here on the authority of Millar's list in 2d ed. of *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 1758, and because of the use made of the story in *The Lover's Assistant*, line 295 *et seq.*

1747

OVID'S ART of LOVE Paraphrased, and | Adapted to the Present Time. With Notes. | And a most correct Edition of the ORIGINAL. Book I. | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to *Catherine-street in the Strand*; | and sold by M. COOPER, in *Pater-noster Row*; A. DODD, without | *Temple-Bar*; and G. WOODFALL at *Charing-Cross*. | (Price Two Shillings.)

Published Feb. 1747 (*Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 108; also *London Mag.* March, p. 152; *Scots Mag.* Feb. p. 100).

No copy known. The title is taken from the advertisement in *Jacobite's Journal*, no. 15, March 12, 1748. As advertised earlier in *St. James's Evening Post*, March 21-24 and March 24-26, 1747, "Book I." does not appear in the title; and the imprint, which does not have Millar's name, varies considerably. The three magazines have "Times" instead of "Time." Probably there were two impressions or editions of the paraphrase within the first year. Given in Millar's list in *Jonathan Wild*, 1754; and in *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 2d ed., 1758.

THE | LOVER'S ASSISTANT, | or, NEW YEAR's Gift; | Being, a | NEW ART OF LOVE, | Adapted to the PRESENT TIMES. | Translated from the LATIN, with NOTES, | By the late Ingenious | HENRY FIELDING | Of FACETIOUS MEMORY. | LONDON, Printed: | And Dublin, Reprinted, and Sold by the Booksellers. | M DCC LIX. | [Price a British Shilling.]

4 p. l. (Title, Preface); 87 pp. In Brit. Mus.

A reprint of *Ovid's Art of Love Paraphrased*.

In *Jacobite's Journal* no. 15, March 12, 1748, Fielding drew an extended

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

comparison between the art of love and the art of Jacobitism. It was based on this translation. Internal evidence confirms the ascription of the paraphrase to Fielding. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works. See this biography, vol. II, pp. 52-54.

FAMILIAR | LETTERS | BETWEEN THE | Principal Characters |  
IN | DAVID SIMPLE, | And SOME OTHERS. | To which is added, |  
A VISION. | — | By the AUTHOR of | DAVID SIMPLE. | — |  
| IN TWO VOLUMES. | — | VOL. I. [II.] | = | LONDON: |  
| Printed for the AUTHOR: | And Sold by A. MILLAR, opposite |  
Katharine-Street in the Strand. | M.DCC.XLVII.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xlviii (Preface, written by a Friend of the Author, The List of Subscribers); 352 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 392 pp. 7½ x 5. Title of vol. II does not include the words, "In two volumes."

Published April 10, 1747 (*St. James's Evening Post*, April 7-9, 1747; also *Gent. Mag.* April, p. 204; *London Mag.* May, p. 247). In Yale.

The Preface and Letters XL-XLIV by Henry Fielding.

Preface reprinted in Fielding's Works, London, 1762, vol. II, pp. 600-603; Letter XLI in Fielding's Works, London, 1893, vol. XIII, pp. 232-242; Letters XL-XLIV in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XVI, pp. 25-52.

A Compleat and Authentick | HISTORY of the | RISE, PROGRESS, | and | Extinction | of the LATE REBELLION, | And of the | PROCEEDINGS | Against the | PRINCIPAL PERSONS | concerned therein. | Containing: | A clear and impartial | Narrative of the Intrigues of the Preten- | der's Adherents before the Breaking out of their Design in *North-Britain*; | their Proceedings after their taking Arms; the Actions | in that Part of the ISLAND before they march'd Southwards; their | March to *Derby*, and true Reasons of their Retreat; the Dispute | at *Falkirk*, | and Motives of their transferring the War into the | *Highlands*, with the principal Causes of their Defeat at *Culloden*. | Interspersed with the Characters of their chief *Leaders*, and a | curious Detail of their Negotiations abroad. |

The whole compos'd with the greatest Accuracy possible in regard to | Facts and Dates, and free from all Mixture of fictitious Circum- | stances, or illgrounded Conjectures. | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe*, in *Pater-Noster-Row*. | MDCC-XLVII.

1 p. l. (Title); 155 pp. Fold. chart: A plan of the action at Seatonne. 8vo.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published April, 1747 (*Gent. Mag.* April, p. 204). In Brit. Mus. Never reprinted.

See this biography, vol. II, pp. 54-57.

A | DIALOGUE | BETWEEN A | GENTLEMAN of LONDON, | Agent for two Court Candidates, | AND AN | HONEST ALDERMAN | Of the Country Party. | WHEREIN | The GRIEVANCES under which the | Nation at present *groans* are fairly and | impartially laid open and considered. | Earnestly address'd to the | ELECTORS of GREAT-BRITAIN. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noster-Row*. 1747.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 91 pp. 8 x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published June, 1747 (*London Mag.* June, p. 296; also *Gent. Mag.* June, p. 300). In Yale.

Acknowledged by Fielding in *A Proper Answer*, 1747, p. 28 note. Quoted from by Fielding in *Jacobite's Journal*, no. 10, Feb. 6, 1748.

2d ed. London, 1747. 1 p. l. (Title); 92 pp. 8 x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Dec. 19, 1747 (*Jacobite's Journal*, Dec. 19). Advertisement has motto: *Pro Republica semper*. Title has: By the Author of the True Patriot, and | A Serious Address to the People of Great Britain. | The Second Edition. In New York Pub. Lib.

Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

A PROPER | ANSWER | To A LATE | Scurrilous Libel, | ENTITLED, | *An Apology for the Conduct of a late | celebrated Second-rate Minister.* | By the AUTHOR of the *Jacobite's Journal*. | *Hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto.* | [Cut] | LONDON, | Printed for M. COOPER in *Pater-noster-Row*. | MDCCXLVII. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title); iii-iv (Advertisement); 5-44 pp. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Dec. 24, 1747 (*Jacobite's Journal*, Dec. 19, also *Gent. Mag.* Dec. pp. 575, 596). In Yale.

In all the advertisements and also in *Gent. Mag.* Dec. p. 596 and in *Scots Mag.* Dec. p. 612 the title reads: A full answer, etc.

2d ed. London, 1748. Published Jan. 2, 1748 (*Jacobite's Journal*, Jan. 2). First reprinted in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XV, pp. 339-364.

1747-1748

THE | JACOBITE's JOURNAL. | [Cut] | — | By JOHN TROTT PLAID, *Esq.* | — | SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1747. NUMB. 1. [-NOVEMBER 5, 1748. NUMB. 49.] |

4 p. Printed page: 12 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 9 (of first 12 nos.; afterwards page is slightly

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

enlarged and margins, which vary in different nos., increased an inch in length and half an inch in width). Cut in nos. 1-12 only.

Colophon for no. 1: *LONDON*; Printed by W. STRAHAN, in *Wine-Office-Court, Fleetstreet*; and Sold by M. COOPER, in *Pater- | Noster-Row*, and G. WOODFALL, at *Charing-Cross*. Where ADVERTISEMENTS, and Letters to the AUTHOR | are taken in.

Colophon for nos. 2-3: *LONDON*: Printed for M. COOPER, in *Pater-Noster-Row*; C. CORBETT, in *Fleet-street*; Mrs. NUTT, at the | *Royal-Exchange*; and G. WOODFALL, at *Charing-Cross*. Where ADVERTISEMENTS, and Letters to the AUTHOR | are taken in.

Colophon for nos. 4-49: *LONDON*; Printed for M. COOPER, in *Pater-Noster-Row*; C. CORBETT, in *Fleet-street*; and G. WOODFALL, | at *Charing-Cross*. Where ADVERTISEMENTS and Letters to the AUTHOR are taken in.

Brit. Mus. has all but no. 41, Sept. 10, 1748; photographs of these in Yale.

Extracts from nos. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 45, and 47 in *Gent. Mag.*; from nos. 9, 14 in *London Mag.*; from no. 16 in *Scots Mag.* Nothing from the missing no. 41, is in *Gent.*, *London*, or *Scots Mag.* Nos. 15 and 34 reprinted in Fielding's Works, London, 1762, vol. III, pp. 592-597; none of the others ever reprinted in Fielding's Works.

1748

THE | IMPORTANT TRIFLERS. | A | SATIRE: | SET FORTH | In a JOURNAL of Pastime *A-la-mode*, | among the Young-People of FASHION, in the | Spring-Season of the Year, | AND | Addressed as a TRIFLE, to the Polite | Ladies in Town, and to the Beau-monde in General. | (*To which is added, A WHIMSICAL | PIECE OF POETRY.*) | = | By HENRY FIELDING, Esqr; Author of | TOM JONES. | = | —*Qui capit, Ille facit. Hor.* | —*T'is so pat to all the Tribe, | Each cries --- "That was levell'd at Me."* | BEGG. OPERA. | = | DUBLIN: | Printed by JAMES HOEY, in *Skinner-Row*.  
1749.

2 p. 1. (Title, Affidavit, dated 16° Aprilis 1749, Advertisement); [5]-16 pp. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ . In Yale.

First published anonymously London, Cooper, April, 1748 (*Gent. Mag.* April, p. 192; also *Scots Mag.* April, p. 208; *London Mag.* May, p. 239).

No copy of London edition known. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works. On Fielding's probable authorship, see this biography, vol. II, pp. 136-138.

1749

THE | HISTORY | OF | TOM JONES, | A | FOUNDLING. | — | In SIX VOLUMES. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — | —*Mores hominum multorum vidit.* — | = | LONDON: | Printed for

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MILLAR, over-against | *Catharine-street in the Strand.* | MDCC-XLIX.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-lxii pp. (Dedication: "To the Honourable George Lyttleton, Esq;"; Contents); [1] p. (Errata); 214 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 324 pp. Vol. III: 1 p. l. (Title); 370 pp. Vol. IV: 1 p. l. (Title); 312 pp. Vol. V: 1 p. l. (Title); 294 pp. Vol. VI: 1 p. l. (Title); 304 pp.  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{3}{8}$ . Titles of vols. II-VI have Vol. II, III, IV, V, VI in place of the words, "In Six Volumes." Title of vol. V has motto: —*Mores Hominum Multorum.* Vols. II, III, IV, VI omit the period after *vidit*. At least two printers were employed by Millar for the work.

Published Feb. 28, 1749 (*General Advertiser*, Feb. 28; also *Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 96; *London Mag.* Feb. pp. 51-55, 100). In Yale.

2d ed., though not so named. London, 1749. Titles and paging mainly as in the first edition, except as noted below. Vol. I, the unpage leaf of Errata is omitted, and in its place is p. lxiii, the contents being expanded to fill. This edition was apparently begun before the first edition was completed, as the errors are pointed out in the first five volumes only. An attempt was made to make this a paginary reprint of the first, but the variations are numerous.

Probably published April 13, 1749 (*St. James's Evening Post*, April 11-13). In Yale.

THE | HISTORY | OF | TOM JONES, | A | FOUNDLING. | — |  
In FOUR VOLUMES. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — |  
—*Mores hominum multorum vidit*— | = | LONDON: Printed for  
A. MILLAR, over-against | *Catharine-street in the Strand.* | MDCC-XLIX.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xx pp. (Dedication: "To the Honourable George Lyttleton," Contents); 304 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-viii pp. (Contents); 330 pp. Vol. III: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-x pp. (Contents); 288 pp. Vol. IV: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xii pp. (Contents); 347 pp.  $6\frac{1}{16} \times 4$ . Titles of vols. II-IV have Vol. II, III, IV in place of the words, "In Four Volumes."

This is the third edition, though not so named. Apparently Fielding's final revision, and is the text usually followed in modern editions.

Published by April 13, 1749 (*St. James's Evening Post*, April 11-13). In Yale.

Other editions, British and foreign: Dublin, 1749. In Yale; Amsteldam, 1749-50; 4th authorized ed. London, 1750, published Dec. 12, 1749 (*St. James's Evening Post*, Dec. 9-12). In Yale; Londres, 1750. In Yale; Amsterdam, 1750. In Yale; Dresden, 1750. In Yale; Hamburg, 1750; Londres, 1751. In Yale; Paris, 1751. In Yale; Venezia, 1757. In Yale; Napoli, 1758. In Philadelphia Lib.; Hamburg, 1758-59, 7 vols. including *Tom Jones in Married State*. In Yale; Dublin, 1759. In Yale; En France, 1762. In Yale; Am-

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

steldorf, 1763. In Yale; 5th ed. London, 1763. In Yale; Berlin, 1764; Dresden, 1764; Paris, 1764; Westeras, 1765; 6th ed. London, 1765; Dublin, 1766; Dublin, 1767. In Yale; Paris, 1767. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1767. In Yale; 7th ed. London, 1768; Paris, 1770; St. Petersburg, 1770-71; Edinburgh, 1771. In Yale; Leipzig, 1771; Hamburg, 1771; London, 1773. In Yale; Dresden, 1773; London, 1774; Dresden, 1774. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1774. In Yale; Paisley, 1775. In New York Pub. Lib.; Paris, 1775; Paris, 1776-77; Paris, 1777. In Yale; Abridged, London, 1778. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1779; London, 1780. 4 vols. In Yale; London, 1780. 9 vols. In Brit. Mus.; London, 1780, 3 vols. In Brit. Mus.; Paris, 1780. 4 vols. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1780. In Yale; Paris, 1780. 8 vols.; Nürnberg, 1780. In Yale; London, 1781; Geneva, 1782. In Yale; London, 1782. In Yale; London, 1783. In Yale; Londres, 1783. In Yale; Polish tr. Warszawie, 1783; Paris, 1784. In Yale; Reims, 1784. In Yale; London [1785 ?]; London, 1786; Leipzig, 1786-88. In Yale; Polish tr. Wien, 1786-88; London, 1787. In Yale; Moscow, 1787; Lipsk, 1787; Carlsruhe, 1787-88. In Yale; Wien, 1788; Paris, 1788; London, 1789; London, 1791; Basel, 1791. In Yale; Gotha, 1791; Edinburgh, 1791. In Yale; London, 1791; Abridged, London, 1792. In Brit. Mus.; London, Cooke [1792]. In Yale; London, Murray, 1792. In Yale; London, Longman, 1792. In Yale; Warsaw, 1793; London, 1794; Paris, 1794. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1795; Geneva, 1796. In Yale; Madrid, 1796; Paris [1796]. In Yale; London, Cooke [1798]. In Yale; Paris, 1801. In Yale; Londres, 1801. In Yale; Paris, 1804; Breslau, 1804; Gotha, 1804. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1805. In Yale; London, 1807. In Yale; London, 1808; London, 1809; London, Cooke [1810]. In Yale; London, Rivington, 1810. In Yale; London, 1811. In Yale; Marburg, 1814 *seq.*; London, 1816; Dublin, 1818; London, 1818. In Yale; London, 1819. In Yale; Paris [1820]. In Yale; London, 1820. In Yale; London, 1823. In Yale; Paris, Dalibon, 1823. In Yale; Paris, Parmentier, 1823; Chiswick, 1823. In Yale; London, 1825. In Yale; Leipzig, 1826. In Yale; London, 1826. In Brit. Mus.; Paris, 1828. In Yale; London, 1828; London, 1831. In Yale; London, 1832; Paris, 1832. In Yale; Paris, 1833. In Yale; London, 1834. In Yale; Paris, 1835. In Yale; New York, 1836; Braunschweig, 1840; Paris, 1841. In Yale; Braunschweig, 1841-42. In Yale; Leipzig, 1844. In Yale; Spanish tr. 1846; London, 1847; Braunschweig, 1848; St. Petersburg, 1849. In Brit. Mus.; Pesth, 1853; Kjøbenhavn, 1854-55. In Yale; London, 1857. In Yale; Stuttgart [1860]. In Yale; Haarlem, 1862. In Yale; London, 1868. In Brit. Mus.; Praze, 1872. In Brit. Mus.; London, 1873; London, 1876; London, 1878. In Yale; New York, 1879. In Yale; London, 1880; New York, 1882. In Yale; Stuttgart, 1883; London, 1884; London, 1887. In Yale; London, 1892; New York, 1892; London, 1893; Boston, 1896; Abridged, London, 1896. In Yale; London, 1897. In Yale; London, Sands, 1899. In Yale; London, Dent, 1899. In Yale; London, 1900. In Yale; London, 1902; Cambridge, 1903; New York, 1904; Abridged, London, 1904; Lon-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

don, 1904. In Yale; London, Methuen [1905]. In Yale; London, Bell, 1905. In Yale; New York, Burt [1906]. In Yale; New York, Century, 1906. In Yale; London, 1907; New York, 1907; London, 1908; London, 1909; London, 1910. In Yale; London, 1913. In Yale; London, 1915. In Yale. Yale has also seven editions without dates.

*Stultus versus Sapientem: | IN THREE | LETTERS | TO THE | FOOL, | ON | SUBJECTS the most Interesting. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | — | [4 lines of quotation] | PHÆD. | — | The Second EDITION. | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: Printed and | DUBLIN Re-printed by E. BATE, in | George's-Lane, 1749.*

1 p. l. (Title); 3-23 pp.  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 4$ .

Published London, ca. May 1, 1749 (*London Mag.* May, p. 244, in Register of Books for April and May). Publisher's name not given.

No copy of the London edition is known. Dublin edition in Yale. Never reprinted in Fielding's Works. See this biography, vol. II, pp. 136-138.

*A | CHARGE | DELIVERED TO THE | GRAND JURY, | AT THE | SESSIONS of the PEACE | HELD FOR THE | City and Liberty of West-minster, &c. | On THURSDAY the 29th of JUNE, 1749 | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | CHAIRMAN of the said SESSIONS. | PUBLISHED | By Order of the COURT, and at the unanimous | Request of the Gentlemen of the GRAND JURY. | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite Catherine-Street, in | the Strand. 1749.*

1 p. l. (Title, Vote of the Sessions); [7]-64 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{5}{8}$ .

Published ca. July 20, 1749 (*St. James's Evening Post*, July 18-20; also *Gent. Mag.* July, p. 336; *London Mag.* July, p. 340; *Monthly Review*, July, pp. 239-240). In Yale.

Dublin, 1749. In New York Pub. Lib. The Vote of the Sessions has never been reprinted.

*A | TRUE STATE | OF THE | CASE | OF | BOSAVERN PEN-LEZ, | Who suffered on Account of the late | RIOT in the STRAND. | IN WHICH | The Law regarding these Offences, and the | Statute of GEORGE the First, commonly | called the Riot Act, are fully con-sidered. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | Barrister at Law, and one of his Majesty's Justices | of the Peace for the County of Middlesex, and | for the City and Liberty of Westminster. | — | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite Katherine- | street in the Strand. 1749. | [Price One Shilling.]*

1 p. l. (Title); 54 pp.  $7\frac{7}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ .

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Published ca. Nov. 18, 1749 (*St. James's Evening Post*, Nov. 16-18; also *Gent. Mag.* Nov. pp. 512-513, 528; *London Mag.* Nov. pp. 520-521, 532; *Monthly Review*, Nov. pp. 64-65). In Yale.

First reprinted in Fielding's Works, London, 1872.

1750

THE | AUTHOR's FARCE; | WITH A | PUPPET-SHOW, |  
CALL'D THE | PLEASURES of the TOWN. | AS ACTED at the | THEATRE  
ROYAL in *Drury-Lane*. | — | Written by *HENRY FIELDING*,  
Esq.; | — | *Quis iniquæ Tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus, ut*  
*teneat se?* | Juv. Sat. I. | — | The THIRD EDITION. | This PIECE  
was Originally ACTED at the *Hay-Market*, and | Revived some Years  
after at *Drury-Lane*, when it was Revised, | and greatly Alter'd by  
the AUTHOR, as now Printed. | — | LONDON: | Printed for J.  
WATTS at the Printing-Office in | *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn*  
*Fields*. | — | MDCCCL. Price 1 s. 6 d.

3 p. l. (Title, Prologue, Persons in the Farce, Persons in the Puppet-  
Show); [7]-68 pp.; [4] pp. (Epilogue). 8 x 4 1/4. In Yale.

This is the altered play from which has been derived the text in all collections of Fielding's Works.

Geschichte JONATHAN WILDS, aus dem Engl. KOPENHAGEN, 1750,  
bei Rothe.

Listed by Augustus Wood, *Einfluss Fieldings auf die Deutsche Literatur*.  
Yokohama, 1895, p. 20.

1751

AN | ENQUIRY | Into the CAUSES of the late | Increase of Rob-  
bers, &c. | WITH SOME | PROPOSALS for Remedying this | GROW-  
ING EVIL. | IN WHICH | The Present Reigning VICES are impartially |  
exposed; and the Laws that relate to the | Provision for the POOR,  
and to the Punish- | ment of FELONS are largely and freely ex- |  
amined. | *Non jam sunt mediocres hominum libidines, non humanæ*  
*auda- | ciaæ ac tolerandæ. Nihil cogitant nisi cædem, nisi incendia,* |  
*nisi rapinas.* Cic. in Catil. 2da. | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; |  
Barrister at Law, and One of His Majesty's Justices | of the Peace  
for the County of Middlesex, and for | the City and Liberty of  
Westminster. | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to  
*Katharine-Street*, | in the *Strand*. M.DCC.LI. | [Price 2 s. 6 d.]

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-xv pp. (Dedication: "To the Right Honourable

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Philip Lord Hardwick," The Preface); 127 pp.; [1] p. (To the Public).  
 $7\frac{3}{4}$  x  $4\frac{3}{4}$ .

Published Jan. 1751 (*London Mag.* Jan. p. 48; also *Gent. Mag.* Jan. pp. 3-4, 48; *Monthly Review*, Jan. pp. 229-239). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1751. In Yale; Dublin, 1751. In Yale. The page "To the Public" (probably written by John Fielding) first reprinted in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XIII, pp. 128-129.

A | PLAN | OF THE | Universal Register-Office, | OPPOSITE | CECIL-STREET in the STRAND, | AND OF | That in BISHOPSGATE-STREET, the Corner | of CORNHILL. | Both by the same PROPRIETORS. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed in the Year MDCCCLII. | [Price Three-pence]

2 p. l. (Title, "To the Reader," signed: John Fielding, One of the Proprietors of the Universal Register Office); [5]-19 pp.  $8\frac{1}{2}$  x  $5\frac{1}{4}$ . In Yale.

The earliest edition in Yale and in the Brit. Mus. is dated 1752, but the pamphlet was published in Feb. or March, 1751. In the list of books under "The Inspector," p. 14, in *The Student*, No. VI, vol. II, issued in March, 1751, is the entry: "A Plan of the Universal Register Office in the Strand, recommended by H. Fielding, 3d." Probably the entry was made by Christopher Smart.

The main part of the pamphlet (pp. 5-18) is certainly by Henry Fielding. In all editions, so far as known, the text never has the signature of John Fielding.

London, 1753. In Yale; 8th ed. London, 1755. In Yale.  
Never reprinted in Fielding's Works.

AMELLIA. | BY | Henry Fielding, Esq.; — | *Felices ter & amplius* | *Quos irrupta tenet Copula.* | Γυναικὸς ὀνδὲν χρῆμ' ἀνὴρ λήξεται | 'Εσθλῆς ἀμεινον, οὐδὲ ρίγιον κακῆς. | — | In FOUR VOLUMES. | — | VOL. I. [II., III., IV.] | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the *Strand*. | M.DCC.LII.

Vol. I: 3 p. l. (Title, "To Ralph Allen, Esq."); vii-xii pp. (Contents); 285 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-viii pp. (Contents); 262 pp.; [1] p. ("At the Universal-Register-Office, op-| posite to *Cecil-Street in the Strand*"). Vol. III: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-ix (Contents); 323 pp. Vol. IV: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-vii (Contents); 296 pp.  $6\frac{3}{8}$  x 4. Titles of vols. II-IV do not include the words, "In four volumes."

Published Dec. 18, 1751 (*Whitehall Evening Post*, Dec. 17-19; also *General Advertiser*, Dec. 2; *London Mag.* Dec. pp. 531-535, 576, 592-596; *Gent. Mag.* Dec. p. 574; *Monthly Review*, Dec. pp. 510-515; *Gent. Mag.* March, 1752, pp. 102-103). In Yale.

There were two impressions. Strahan printed 5000 copies of vols. I and III in Dec. 1751, and 3000 copies of same volumes in Jan. 1752. Printer of vols. II and IV unknown. Vols. I and III differ from vols. II and IV in paper,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

in founts used for title-pages and for table of contents, and incidentally in other respects. Vol. I and III have four mistakes in the first line of the Greek quotation on title-page. The two impressions perhaps undistinguishable. See this biography, vol. II, pp. 304-308.

Other editions, British and foreign: Hanover, 1752; Frankfurth und Leipzig, 1752. In Yale; Amsteldam, 1758. In Yale; London, 1762, in Works, Vol. IV, pp. i-xi, 327, revised from notes by the author, Chapter 2 of Book V being omitted; Paris, 1762. In Yale; 3d ed. Frankfurth, 1763; Paris, 1763. In Yale; Frankfurth, 1764; Frankfurth, 1768; Paris, 1772; London, 1775. In Yale; London, 1780. In Yale; Leipzig, 1781; Leipzig, 1781-82; Milan, 1782; Rheims, 1784. In Yale; London, 1785. In Yale; Venezia, 1786; London, 1790. In Yale; [Paris] 1790. In Yale; Madrid, 1795-96. In Brit. Mus.; Leipzig, 1797. In Yale; London, Cooke [1798]. In Yale; London, 1799. In Yale; London, 1800; Jena und Leipzig, 1801; Dresden, 1803; London, 1808. In Yale; London, 1811. In Yale; Dublin, 1818; London, 1832. In Yale; Paris, 1834. In Yale; New York, 1837. In Yale; New York, 1852; London, 1857; London, 1877, includes Chapter 2 of Book V. In Yale; New York, 1882. In Yale; London, 1884. In Yale; New York, 1886; London, 1893; London, 1902; London, 1903; London, 1905; London, 1906. In Yale; London, 1914. In Yale.

1752

The Covent-Garden Journal. | — | By Sir ALEXANDER DRAWCANSIR, Knt. Censor of GREAT BRITAIN. | — | SATURDAY, JANUARY 4. [-NOVEMBER 25.] 1752. NUMB. 1. [-72.] | — | To be continued every TUESDAY and SATURDAY. | — |

4 pp.  $16\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ . No. 5 and after has: Price 3d.] on left of date line. Nos. 53-72 substitute the words: To be continued every SATURDAY in the Morning.

Nos. 1-52, semi-weekly; nos. 53-72, weekly. No. 61 is dated Aug. 29 and no. 62 is dated Sept. 15, on account of change in the calendar.

Colophon for no. 1: LONDON: Printed, and Sold by Mrs. DODD, at the Peacock, Temple-Bar; and at the UNIVERSAL REGISTER | OFFICE, opposite Cecil-street, in the Strand; where ADVERTISEMENTS and LETTERS to the AUTHOR are taken in.

Colophon for no. 2 adds to the above the words: *Where may be had the First Number.*

Colophon for nos. 3-26, 29-72, substitutes for the above the words: *Where may be had the former Numbers.*

Bottom of first page of nos. 3-25, and the colophon for nos. 27-28: *All imaginable Care hath been taken to supply the Subscribers with this Paper, but if, notwithstanding this, any Gentleman or Lady should not have received it, on sending their Names either to Mrs. Dodd, or to the Universal Register | Office, opposite Cecil-Street in the Strand, they will be carefully supplied for the future.*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nos. 1, 2, 26, 27, 29, 30, and 31 have nothing at the bottom of the first page.

Bottom of first page of no. 28: *LONDON: Printed, and Sold by Mrs. DODD, at the Peacock, Temple-Bar; and at the UNIVERSAL REGISTER | OFFICE, opposite Cecil-Street, in the Strand; where ADVERTISEMENTS and LETTERS to the AUTHOR are | taken in. Where may be had the former Numbers.*

Bottom of first page of nos. 32-72: Note: *This Paper is to be had at the Universal Register Office, next the Corner of Bishopsgate-street, Cornhill.*

The set in Brit. Mus. wants no. 61 and parts of nos. 71 and 72. Complete set in collection of J. H. Wrenn of Chicago. Photographs of complete set in Yale. Essays from nos. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 17, 21, 23, 24, 33, 34, 35, 37, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60 and 61 reprinted in *Fielding's Works*, London, 1762, vol. IV, pp. 365-433. To these Leslie Stephen, in *Fielding's Works*, London, 1882, vol. VI, pp. 3-173, added 11 nos. *viz.* nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 18, 27, 31, 43 and 70. In *Works*, 1762, no. 33 is dated April 23; should be April 25; corrected in the ed. of 1882. Reprinted in part by James Hoey in a Dublin *Covent-Garden Journal* described below. Extracts reprinted in *Gent. Mag.* Jan. 1752, pp. 25-30 and Feb. pp. 53-55; also *London Mag.* April, 1752, p. 168 and May, pp. 201-202, neither by Fielding. First published complete, with introduction and notes by G. E. Jensen, in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, 2 vols. New Haven, 1915.

A parody on Fielding's journal appeared under the title:

THE | Covent-Garden JOURNAL | EXTRAORDINARY. |  
— | By Sir ALEXANDER DRAWCANSIR, Knt. Censor of  
*Great-Britain* | — | Price 3d MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1752.  
Numb. I. | —

6 pp. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ . At head of title: (I).

Colophon: *LONDON: | Printed for J. SHARP near Temple-Bar.*

Apparently written by Bonnell Thornton. Only known copy in Yale.

The | Covent-Garden Journal. | — | By Sir ALEXANDER DRAWCANSIR, Knt. Censor of *Great-Britain*. | (Otherwise HENRY FIELDING, Esq.;) | — | THURSDAY, JANUARY 23d, 1752.  
NUMB. I. | — | To be continued WEEKLY. | —

4 pp. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 8 (with trimmed margins).

Colophon for no. 1: DUBLIN: Printed by JAMES HOEY, at the Sign of Mercury, in Skinner-Row. Subsequent colophons vary slightly.

Title for nos. 77-82:

THE | Covent-Garden Journal: | *Or, the CENSOR.* | — |  
By Sir ALEXANDER DRAWCANSIR, Knt. (alias Henry Fielding,  
Esq.;)

Title for nos. 83-86:

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

## The Censor. | Or, COVENT-GARDEN JOURNAL.

The file in the Yale library ends with no. 86. The file in the British Museum ends with no. 100, except for some scattered issues of later date. Nos. 1-50 comprise Vol. I; and nos. 51-100 Vol. II. Hoey reprinted, with alterations, most of Fielding's leaders and much miscellaneous material from the London *Covent-Garden Journal*.

EXAMPLES | OF THE | INTERPOSITION | OF | PROVI-  
DENCE | IN THE | DETECTION and PUNISHMENT | OF | MURDER. |  
CONTAINING, | Above thirty Cases, in which this dreadful | Crime  
has been brought to Light, in the | most extraordinary and miracu-  
lous Man- | ner; collected from various authors, anti- | ent and  
modern. | WITH AN | INTRODUCTION and CONCLUSION, | Both written |  
By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | — | LONDON: | Printed for A.  
MILLAR in the Strand. | MDCCLII. | [Price bound One Shilling, or  
Ten Shillings | a Dozen to those who give them away.]

1 p. l. (Title); iii pp. (Dedication: "To the Right Rev. Father in God, Isaac Lord Bishop of Worcester"); 94 pp. 5½ x 3.

Published April 13, 1752 (*Covent-Garden Journal*, April 11; also *Gent. Mag.* April, 1752, p. 195; *London Mag.* April, p. 194; *Monthly Review*, April, p. 311). In Yale.

Dublin, 1752. In Yale; 2d ed. London, 1764, in *A Right Pleasant and famous Collection of Histories*, vol. V.; London, 1799; Bath, 1820. In Brit. Mus.

First reprinted in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XVI, pp. 111-165.

PROPOSALS for Printing by Subscription | A NEW TRANSLA-  
TION into ENGLISH, | Of the WORKS of | LUCIAN | From the Ori-  
ginal Greek: | With Notes Historical, Critical, and Explanatory. |  
By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | AND | The Rev. Mr. WILLIAM  
YOUNG.

Advertisement in *The Covent Garden Journal*, no. 27, June 27, 1752. No part of this translation, if made, was ever printed.

NOTICE. *The Covent-Garden Journal*, Nov. 25, 1752. The same in *The General Advertiser*, Nov. 25, 1752. Reprinted with alterations in *The Public Advertiser*, Dec. 1, 1752.

Probably no other contribution by Fielding, at or near this time, to the *Advertiser* under either of its names, except a few legal notices prepared by his clerk.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1753

A | PROPOSAL | FOR | Making an Effectual Provision | FOR THE | POOR, | FOR | Amending their MORALS, | AND FOR | Rendering them useful MEMBERS of the | SOCIETY. | To which is added, | A PLAN of the BUILDINGS proposed, with | proper Elevations. | Drawn by an Eminent Hand. | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | Barrister at Law, and one of his Majesty's Justices of the | Peace for the County of Middlesex. | *Ista sententia maximè et fallit imperitos, et obest sèpissime | Reipublicæ, cùm aliquid verum et rectum esse dicitur, sed | obtineri, id est obsisti posse populo, negatur.* | *Cic. de Leg. lib. 3.* | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand. | MDCC-LIII. |

1 p. l. (Title, Explanation of the Plan); [iii]-iv pp. (Dedication: "To the Right Honourable Henry Pelham"); 91 pp.; [1] p. (Books printed for A. Millar, and written by Henry Fielding, Esq.).  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{8}$ . Folded plate, Thos. Gibson Archt.; J. Mynde Sculp. In Yale.

Published Jan. 1753 (Dedication dated Jan. 19, 1753; also *Gent. Mag.* Jan. p. 55; *Monthly Review* Feb. p. 150; *London Mag.* Feb. pp. 74-78). In Yale.

Dublin, 1753. In Brit. Mus. First reprinted in Fielding's Works, ed. Goss, London, 1899, Vol. XII, pp. 63-158.

A | CLEAR STATE | OF THE | CASE | OF | *ELIZABETH CANNING*, | Who hath sworn that she was robbed and almost starved | to Death by a Gang of Gipsies and other Villains in | *January* last, for which one MARY SQUIRES now | lies under Sentence of Death. | — | *Quæ, quia sunt admirabilia, contraque Opinionem | omnium; tentare volui possentne proferri in Lucem, & | ita dici ut probarentur.* | *CICERO. Parad.* | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR in the Strand. | M.DCC.LIII. | (Price One Shilling.)

1 p. l. (Title); 62 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{8}$ . Postscript written Sunday, March 18, 1753.

Published *ca.* March 20, 1753 (*London Mag.* March, pp. 142-144; also *Gent. Mag.* March, p. 151; *Monthly Review*, March, p. 232). In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1753. In Yale; Dublin, 1753. In Yale; London, 1754. In Brit. Mus. First published in Fielding's Works, vol. XI, 1872.

1754

THE | LIFE | OF | Mr. JONATHAN WILD | THE GREAT. | A NEW EDITION | *With considerable Corrections and Additions.* | — |

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

BY | *HENRY FEILDING*, Esq; | — | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand. | — | MDCCLIV.

1 p. l. (Title); [2] pp. (Advertisement from the Publisher to the Reader); vi pp. (Contents); [1] p. (Books printed for A. Millar, op- | posite Catharine-Street in the Strand); [1] p. (Books printed and sold by A. Millar); 263 pp.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{8}$ .

Published March 19, 1754 (*Whitehall Evening Post*, March 16-19; also *Monthly Review*, March, p. 238). In Yale.

Previously published, before revision, in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. III; and in *Ger. trans.*, Copenhagen, 1750. Later editions: Amsterdam, 1757. In *Brit. Mus.*; Copenhagen, 1758; Paris, 1763; London, 1775 being vol. V of Fielding's Works. In Yale; Lausanne, 1782; Reims, 1782; London, 1782. In Yale; Reims, 1784. In Yale; London, Wenman [1785 ?]; London, 1790. In *Brit. Mus.*; Berlin, 1790; London, Cooke [1793]. In Yale; Leipzig, 1800; London, 1811. In Yale; Zwickau, 1812; Paris, 1834. In Yale; London, Daly, 1840; London, Churton, 1840. In Yale; London, 1842; Halifax, 1843. In Yale; Halifax, 1845. In Yale; London, 1845; New York, 1853; Tweedie, n. d.; London, n. d. In Yale.

## 1755

THE | JOURNAL | OF A | VOYAGE to LISBON, | By the late | HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand. | MDCCLV.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); iv pp. (Dedication to the Public); xvii pp. (The Preface); [19]-41 pp. (The Introduction); [43]-198 (i.e. 246) pp. (The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon); [199]-228 (i.e. 247-276) pp. (A Fragment of a Comment on L. Bolingbroke's Essays).  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{8}$ . Pages 241-276 are incorrectly numbered 193-228.

Published Feb. 25, 1755 (*London Daily Post*, Feb. 22-25; also *London Mag.* Feb. pp. 54-56, 95; *Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 95, March, p. 129; *Monthly Review*, March, pp. 234-235). In Yale.

2d ed., though not so named, London, 1755. Title and Dedication the same as above. xv pp. (The Preface); [17]-37 pp. (The Introduction); 39-219 pp. (The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon); [221]-245 pp. (A Fragment of a Comment on L. Bolingbroke's Essays).

Published ca. Dec. 1, 1755 (*Whitehall Evening Post*, Nov. 29-Dec. 2; also *London Daily Post*, Dec. 4-6). In Yale.

The second edition, which has usually been followed in Fielding's Works, was printed first, but suppressed. On the two editions, see this biography, vol. III, pp. 85-87.

Dublin, 1756, text of the 1st ed.; Altona, 1764; Lausanne, 1783. In Yale; London, 1785, text of the 2d ed. In Yale; London, 1809, in Mavor's Voyages, vol. XI, pp. 201-252, text of 1st ed., abbreviated; Ed. by Dobson, London, 1892, text of 1st ed., with notes. In Yale; London, 1893, text of 2d ed.

# Reise

nach  
der andern Welt  
aus dem Englischen  
des  
Herrn Henry Fielding Esq.  
übersetzt.



Kopenhagen,  
auf Kosten der Kochenschen Buchhandlung, 1759.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

In Yale; Boston, 1902, text of 2d ed. In Yale; Ed. by Dobson, London [1907], text of 1st ed., with notes. In Yale; London, 1907; Ed. by Lobban, Cambridge, 1913, text of 1st ed., without notes. In Yale. Text of second edition in Fielding's Works, London, 1762, vol. IV, pp. 451-527.

1758

A | COLLECTION | OF | POEMS | IN SIX VOLUMES. | BY |  
SEVERAL HANDS. | [Cut] | LONDON: Printed by J. HUGHS, |  
For J. DODSLEY, in PALL-MALL. | MDCCLXVI.

Vol. V: 2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 336 pp. 7 x 4½. In Yale.

Vols. V-VI of this collection were first printed in 1758. Vol. V contains *A Letter to Sir Robert Walpole. By the late Henry Fielding, Esq.:* pp. 117-118; also *Plain Truth. By Henry Fielding, Esq.:* pp. 302-305. The letter to Walpole had appeared in the *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, pp. 41-43; there are variations in the text. No earlier appearance of *Plain Truth* yet discovered; later editions: London, 1763; London, 1765; London, 1766. In Yale; London, 1770; London, 1775; London, 1782. *Plain Truth* first reprinted in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, vol. XII, pp. 345-347.

1759

Reise | nach | der andern Welt | aus dem Englischen | des |  
Herrn Henry Fielding Esq. | übersetzt. | [Cut] | EX RVBICVNDO  
SERENITATEM | M. Tuscher inv., Laan sc. | Kopenhagen, | auf  
Kosten der Rothenschen Buchhandlung. 1759. |

7 p. l. (Title, Vorbericht des Verlegers, Inhalt, Einleitung); [7]-263 pp. 6¾ x 4½. All but the words EX RVBICVNDO SERENITATEM are in German type.

This is the first separate appearance of *A Journey from this World to the Next*, printed originally in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. II, pp. 1-250. In Yale.

Other editions, English and foreign, of *A Journey from this World to the Next*: Kjøbenhavn, 1769. In Yale; London, 1783. In Yale; Reims, 1784. In Yale; Stockholm, 1785. In Yale; London, Cooke [1798]. In Yale; Dresden, 1805; Gotha, 1807. In Yale; Meissen, 1811; Leipzig, 1811; Leipzig, 1812; London, 1816. In Yale; Paris, 1834. In Yale; Jena, 1843; Gotha, 1867.

1761

EXTRACTS | from such of the | PENAL LAWS, | AS | PARTICULARLY RELATE to the PEACE and GOOD | ORDER of this METROPOLIS: | With | OBSERVATIONS for the better EXECUTION | of some, and on the DEFECTS of others. | To which are added, | The FELONIES made so by STATUTE; some general | CAUTIONS to SHOPKEEPERS; and a

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

short TREATISE on | the OFFICE of CONSTABLE. | The whole particularly CALCULATED for the INHABITANTS of | this METROPOLIS. | — | By Sir JOHN FIELDING, | One of His MAJESTY's JUSTICES of the PEACE for the COUNTIES | of MIDDLESEX, ESSEX, and SURRY, and for the CITY and | LIBERTY of WESTMINSTER. | — | A NEW EDITION. | In which is contained Extracts from those PENAL LAWS, made since | the Publication of the last Edition. | = | LONDON: | Printed by H. WOODFALL and W. STRAHAN, Law Printers | to the KING's most EXCELLENT MAJESTY; | For T. CADELL, opposite Catherine-Street in the Strand, 1768.

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-x pp. (Dedication: "To his Grace the Duke of Grafton, First Lord Commissioner of His Majesty's Treasury.", "To the Reader"); [14] pp. (Index); 426 pp. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ . In Brit. Mus.

"A | Treatise | on the | Office of Constable." | : pp. 321-367. This only is by Henry Fielding. Never published in Fielding's Works.

First edition, London, Millar, 1761, published *ca.* Oct. 1761 (*London Mag.* Oct. p. 564).

A New Edition, 1762 (*Retrospective Review*, 1825, vol. XII, pt. II, pp. 216-229); "A New Edition," London, 1769. Text of the 1768 ed., with a new title-page. In Yale.

## 1762

THE | WORKS | OF | HENRY FIELDING, Esq; | WITH | The LIFE of the AUTHOR. | In FOUR VOLUMES. | VOLUME THE FIRST. [SECOND., THIRD., FOURTH.] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite Catharine-Street, in the Strand. | M.DCC.LXII.

Vol. I: 2 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To Ralph Allen, Esq;"); [5]-49 pp. (An Essay on the Life and Genius of Henry Fielding, Esq; signed: Arthur Murphy. Lincoln's Inn, March 25, 1762.); [2] pp. (Contents, Errata); 623 pp. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ . Portrait of Fielding, "Wm. Hogarth, delin. James Basire sculp." faces title-page. Contains: Love in Several Masques; Temple Beau; Author's Farce; Coffee-House Politician; The Tragedy of Tragedies; Letter-Writers; Grub-Street Opera; Lottery; Modern Husband; Mock Doctor; Covent-Garden Tragedy; Debauchees; Miser; Intriguing Chambermaid; Don Quixote in England; An Old Man taught Wisdom.

Vol. II: 2 p. l. (Title, Contents), 603 pp. Contains: Universal Gallant; Pasquin; Historical Register; Eurydice; Eurydice Hiss'd; Tumble-Down Dick; Miss Lucy in Town; The Wedding-Day; Jonathan Wild; Journey from this World to the Next; Joseph Andrews; Preface to David Simple; Preface to The Familiar Letters.

Vol. III: 2 p. l. (Title, Half-title: The History of Tom Jones); [iii]-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

xxiv pp. (Dedication: "To the Honourable George Lyttelton, Esq;"; Contents); 597 pp. Contains: History of a Foundling; Philosophical Transactions; The First Olynthiac of Demosthenes; Of the Remedy of Affliction For the Loss of Our Friends; Dialogue between Alexander the Great and Diogenes the Cynic; Interlude between Jupiter [&c.]; The True Patriot, nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 23 & 24; The Jacobite's Journal, nos. 15 & 34.

Vol. IV: 1 p. l. (Title); v-xi pp. (Contents); [3] pp. (Dedication: "To Ralph Allen, Esq;"; dated: Bow-Street, Dec. 2, 1751, the 1st ed. was dated: Dec. 12.; Half-title: Amelia); 595 pp. Contains: Amelia; An Essay on Conversation; An Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men; The Covent-Garden Journal, nos. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 17, 21, 23, 24, 33, 34, 35, 37, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, & 61; Charge to the Grand Jury; Voyage to Lisbon; Comment on Bolingbroke; Increase of Robbers. This piece is omitted from the table of Contents.

First collected edition of Fielding's Works. In Yale. An 8 vol. ed. was issued about the same date, but it is called the second edition on the title. In Yale. Both editions reviewed in *Monthly Review*, May-July, 1762; also *Gent. Mag.* June, 1762; *London Mag.* Aug. 1762.

3d ed. London, 1766, 12 vols. 12mo, with port. engraved by J. Taylor. In Yale; 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1767. In Yale; London, 1769; Edinburgh, 1771; London, 1771, 8 vols. In Yale; London, 1771, 12 vols. In Yale; London, Strahan, 1775, 12 vols. In Yale; London, Bell, 1775, 12 vols. In Yale; London, 1780; Geneva, 1781-82. In Yale.

### 1778

THE | FATHERS: | OR, | The Good-Natur'd Man. | A COMEDY.  
| As it is Acted at the THEATRE-ROYAL, | IN | DRURY-LANE. | BY  
THE LATE | HENRY FIELDING, ESQ. | AUTHOR OF TOM JONES,  
ETC. | — | LONDON: | PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND. |  
MDCCLXXVIII. | (Price One Shilling and Six Pence.)

1 p. l. (Title, Advertisement); [iii]-viii pp. (Dedication: "To His Grace the Duke of Northumberland," signed: John Fielding; Prologue and Epilogue by Mr. Garrick); 111 pp.; [1] p. (Books, published by the same Author). 8 x 4¾.

First performed Monday, Nov. 30, 1778 (*Public Advertiser*, Nov. 30). Published Dec. 12, 1778 (*Public Advertiser*, Dec. 12; also *Gent. Mag.* Dec. pp. 586-587, 604; *London Mag.* Dec. pp. 550-551). In Yale.

Dublin, 1779; London, 1783. In Brit. Mus.

### 1782

POEMS | ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. | CONSISTING OF | ORIGINAL  
PIECES, | AND | TRANSLATIONS FROM SOME OF THE  
MOST | ADMIRED LATIN CLASSICS: | With the Original

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

TEXT, and copious NOTES, Historical, | Mythological, and Critical, | . . . | VOL. I. | BY S. ROGERS, A. M. | . . . | BATH: Printed by R. CRUTTWELL, | and published by T. SHRIMPTON: | Sold in LONDON by J. DODSLEY, Pall-Mall; C. DILLY, Poultry; | and W. GOLDSMITH, Pater-Noster-Row. | MDCCLXXXII.

6 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I includes: An Extempore, [i]n the Pump-Room at Bath. By the late Henry Fielding, Esq. To Miss H—land. Communicated by a Friend, with the note: "N. B. The above piece is not printed in any edition of Fielding's Works." Had been published in *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, p. 114. There are some variations in the text, the name amongst them, for Fielding wrote "H---and." In Yale.

THE | BEAUTIES OF FIELDING; | Carefully Selected | From the Works | of that | EMINENT WRITER. | To which is added | Some Account of his Life. | [Cut: port. of Fielding] | LONDON. | Printed for G. KEARSLEY *Fleet Street* — 1782 | Price Half a Crown Sewed.

1 p. l. (Engraved Title); xvi pp. (Memoirs of the life and genius of Henry Fielding, Contents); 203 pp. 7 x 4.

2d ed. London, 1782. In Yale; 3d ed. London, 1782; Dublin, 1783. In Yale.

### 1783

THE | WORKS | OF | HENRY FIELDING, Esq.; | WITH | The LIFE of the AUTHOR. | In TWELVE VOLUMES. | VOL. IV. | A NEW EDITION. | TO WHICH IS NOW FIRST ADDED, | THE FATHERS; | OR, THE | GOOD-NATURED MAN. | = | LONDON: | Printed for W. STRAHAN, . . . | MDCCLXXXIII.

6 $\frac{7}{8}$  x 4 $\frac{1}{8}$ . Vol. IV includes: The Fathers, pp. [365]-443. In Yale. Works, London, 1784, 10 vols. 8vo. In Yale; Paris, 1797. In Yale; London, 1803, 12 vols.; Paris, 1804. In Yale.

### 1806

THE | WORKS | OF | HENRY FIELDING, ESQ. | WITH | AN ESSAY | ON | HIS LIFE AND GENIUS, | BY ARTHUR MURPHY, ESQ. | A NEW EDITION, IN TEN VOLUMES. | = | VOL. X. | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. Johnson; . . . | 1806.

8 $\frac{1}{8}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{8}$ . This is Murphy's edition revised by Alexander Chalmers. Vol. X includes: An Essay on Nothing, pp. 135-149, which had been reprinted from the *Miscellanies*, 1743, by Isaac Reed in *The Repository*, 1783, vol. IV, pp. 129-149. In Yale.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Novels: Edinburgh, 1807, 5 vols. In Yale; London, 1808, 14 vols. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1812. In Yale; Edinburgh, 1818. In Yale; New York, 1813-16. In Yale; London, 1821, being vol. I of *Novelist's Library*; London, 1821, 10 vols. In Yale; London, 1824, 12 vols. In Yale; Philadelphia, 1832, 2 vols.; Philadelphia, 1836. In Yale.

1829

THE | BEAUTIES | OF | FIELDING. | CONSISTING OF | SELECTIONS FROM HIS WORKS. | — | BY ALFRED HOWARD, ESQ. | — | LONDON: | PRINTED BY T. DAVISON, | FOR THOMAS TEGG, NO. 73, CHEAPSIDE; | R. GRIFFIN AND CO. GLASGOW; | AND | J. CUMMING, DUBLIN. | [n.d., ca. 1829].

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-iv (Contents); 188 pp.  $5\frac{7}{16}$  x  $3\frac{1}{2}$ . Portrait of Fielding, engraved by W. T. Fry, faces title-page. In Yale.

This is vol. XXIX of *Howard's Beauties of Literature*.

1840

THE | WORKS | OF | HENRY FIELDING, | COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME, | WITH MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR. | — | BY THOMAS ROSCOE. | — | PORTRAIT AND AUTOGRAPH. | LONDON: | PRINTED FOR HENRY WASHBOURNE; H. G. BOHN; SCOTT, WEBSTER, and GEARY; | L. A. LEWIS; JOHN CHIDLEY; WILLIAM GILLING; | and R. GRIFFIN and CO., GLASGOW, | — | 1840.

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-xxviii (Contents, Life and Works of Henry Fielding, signed: Thomas Roscoe, May, 1840; Dedication of: "The History of a Foundling. To the Hon. George Lyttleton"); 1116 pp.  $9\frac{1}{4}$  x  $6\frac{1}{8}$ . Portrait of Fielding engraved by Samuel Freeman faces title-page; and a facsimile of a letter to Mr. Nourse, dated April 20, 1741, follows p. xxviii. In Yale.

Many times reprinted by various publishers.

1870

EPISODES OF FICTION | OR | *Choice Stories from the Great Novelists* | WITH | BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTIONS | — | AND | NUMEROUS ORIGINAL ILLUSTRATIONS BY EMINENT ARTISTS | ENGRAVED ON WOOD BY R. PATERSON | "Pick out of tales the worth" | —GEORGE HERBERT | EDINBURGH | WILLIAM P. NIMMO | 1870

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); [vii]-xiv (Preface, Table of Contents, List of illustrations); 304 pp.  $8\frac{3}{8}$  x  $6\frac{1}{4}$ .

Henry Fielding: pp. 51-67 (Memoir, pp. 53-58, A Hunting Scene, from *Joseph Andrews*, pp. 59-67). In Yale.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1872

MISCELLANIES AND POEMS. | BY | HENRY FIELDING,  
ESQ. | EDITED, WITH PREFACE, | BY | JAMES P. BROWNE, M. D. |  
LONDON: | BICKERS and SON, 1, LEICESTER SQUARE. | H. SOTHERAN  
and co., 136, STRAND. | LITTLE, BROWN and CO., BOSTON, U.S. |  
M.DCCC.LXXII.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); xxvi pp. (Contents, Preface signed: James P. Browne, M. D. February, 1872); 2 l. (Half-title and Title of The Case of Elizabeth Canning); [3]-200 pp. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ; large paper: 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

This is vol. XI of Fielding's Works, published 1871. Contains: The Case of Elizabeth Canning; A True State of the Case of Bosavern Penlez; Preface to the Miscellanies and Poems; Poems from the Miscellanies. Both sizes in Yale.

Reprinted London, Bickers, 1903; New York, Mallet, 1903. Poems reprinted in Fielding's Works ed. by Stephen, London, 1882, and in Fielding's Works, New York, 1903, not elsewhere.

1877

AMELIA. | BY HENRY FIELDING, ESQ. | [4 lines of quotation] | WITH EIGHT ILLUSTRATIONS BY GEORGE CRUIKSHANK. | LONDON: | GEORGE BELL AND SONS, YORK STREET, | COVENT GARDEN. | 1877.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); [v]-xvi pp. (Contents); 1 l. (List of illustrations); 1 p. (Dedication); [2]-594 pp. 8 plates. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ .

This edition of *Amelia* is really vol. IV of an edition of Fielding's Works in four volumes, based upon Roseoe. It restores a chapter in Bk. V.

Pp. 200-203 is "Additional chapter" with note: "This chapter occurs in the original edition of *Amelia*, between the chapters numbered 1 and 2. It is omitted in Murphy's and all subsequent editions. Some slight alterations were made by the author on its omission in the text of the adjoining chapters to render the narrative consecutive. These have been retained here. See note in Biography prefixed to Joseph Andrews, page lxxi."

Note on p. lxxi of Joseph Andrews reads: "Amelia, as it appears in Murphy's collected edition, is said to have been printed from a copy corrected in the author's own handwriting, and the variation from the original text has hitherto passed unnoticed, as well as the omission of the chapter containing 'much physical matter.' As a lost fragment of Fielding this latter will be found (in parenthesis) in its place in the text of this edition of *Amelia*."

This additional chapter was reprinted with the same or similar notes by Linn, Jersey City, 1880; by Bell, London, 1884; and by Croceup & Sterling, in Complete Works, New York, 1903, vol. VI, pp. 228-232.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1882

THE WORKS | OF | HENRY FIELDING, ESQ. | EDITED |  
WITH A BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY | BY | LESLIE STEPHEN |  
IN TEN VOLUMES | VOL. V [VI] | LONDON | SMITH, ELDER &  
CO., 15, WATERLOO PLACE | 1882

10 x 7. Vol. V includes: Articles in *The Champion*, pp. 207-469, taken from the reprint of 1741, publishing 59 nos. out of 94. Omits nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 29, 34, 44, 46, 50, 54, 57, 61, 63, 64, 67, 70, 71, 73, 75, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, of which many were written by Fielding. Vol. VI includes: *The Covent-Garden Journal*, pp. 1-173; the following numbers are reprinted for the first time: 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 18, 27, 31, 43, 70. In Yale.

1893

THE WORKS OF HENRY FIELDING | EDITED BY | GEORGE  
SAINTSBURY | IN TWELVE VOLUMES | VOL. XII. | MISCEL-  
LANIES | VOL. II. | [LONDON PUBLISHED BY J. M. DENT &  
CO. | AT ALDINE HOUSE IN GREAT EASTERN | STREET  
MDCCCXCIII]

8 x 5. Vol. XII includes: *Familiar Letters*, No. XLI, pp. 232-242. In Yale.

1899

THE WORKS OF | HENRY FIELDING | WITH AN INTRODUCTION  
BY | EDMUND GOSSE | VOLUME X [XII] | [Cut] | WESTMIN-  
STER | ARCHIBALD CONSTABLE AND CO. | NEW YORK | CHARLES  
SCRIBNER'S SONS | 1899

85 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 55 $\frac{1}{2}$ . Vol. X includes: Advertisement from the Publisher to the Reader (from *Jonathan Wild*, 1754), pp. xxiii-xxiv; vol. XII includes: A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor, pp. 63-158. In Yale.

FIELDING'S | TOM THUMB | — | Mit Einleitung herausgegeben |  
von | Felix Lindner | [Cut] | BERLIN | VERLAG VON EMIL FELBER |  
1899.

2 p. l. (Title, Inhalt); [VII]-VIII (Vorwort); 111 pp. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ . At head of title: Englische Textbibliothek | Herausgegeben von | Johannes Hoops... | =4=

The edition of 1762 collated with *The Tragedy of Tragedies*, 1731. In Yale.

1903

*The Complete Works of | HENRY FIELDING, ESQ. | With an  
Essay on the Life, Genius and Achievement of the Author, | by |*

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

WILLIAM ERNEST HENLEY, LL.D. | — | ... | Illustrated with | Reproductions of Rare Contemporary Drawings | and Original Designs by | E. E. Carlson and E. J. Read | [Cut] | — | PRINTED FOR SUBSCRIBERS ONLY BY | CROSCUP & STERLING COMPANY | NEW YORK | n. d. [1903]

London copies have the imprint: London | William Heinemann | 1903.

8½ x 5½.

Vol. XII includes: Plain Truth, pp. 345-347. Vol. XIII includes: To the Public, pp. 128-129, probably written by John Fielding. Vol. XIV includes: The Opposition. A Vision, pp. 321-331. Vol. XV includes: A Full Vindication of Her Grace the Duchess Dowager of Marlborough, pp. 5-34; The Vernoniad, pp. 35-60; A Proper Answer to a Late Scurrilous Libel, pp. 339-364; Epilogue to Caelia, pp. 365-366. Vol. XVI includes: Familiar Letters, nos. XL-XLIV, pp. 25-52 (no. XLI had been printed in the Dent ed. of 1893); Dedication and Preface to Plutus, pp. 53-64; Examples of the Interposition of Providence in the Detection and Punishment of Murder, pp. 111-165. Vol. XVI is noteworthy for Mr. Henley's Essay, pp. iii-xli, and for the first attempt at a bibliographical description of first editions of Fielding's separate publications, vol. XVI, pp. xvii-lxii. In Yale.

1905

SELECTED ESSAYS | OF | HENRY FIELDING | EDITED | WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES | BY | GORDON HALL GEROULD, B. LITT. (OXON.) | PRECEPTOR OF ENGLISH IN PRINCETON | UNIVERSITY | — | GINN & COMPANY | BOSTON. NEW YORK. CHICAGO. LONDON | n. d. [1905]

3 p. l. (Half-title, Title); v-lxxxi pp. (Preface, Contents, Introduction); 222 pp. 7½ x 4¾. Port. faces title-page. At head of title: Athenæum Press Series. In Yale.

1909

Wise Sayings and Favorite Passages From the Works of | Henry Fielding | Including His Essay on | Conversation | [Cut] | Cedar Rapids, Iowa | The Torch Press | 1909

4 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Quotation from Fielding, Note); 9-132 pp. 57½ x 3½. Selected by Charles W. Bingham. In Yale.

MASTERS OF LITERATURE | FIELDING | EDITED BY | GEORGE SAINTSBURY, D. LITT., LL. D. | PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE | UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH | [Cut] | LONDON | GEORGE BELL AND SONS | 1909

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

3 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Contents); [ix]-xl (Introduction); 360 pp. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 5. Port. faces title-page. Contains extracts from Fielding's novels and *A Voyage to Lisbon*. In Yale.

1915

THE COVENT-GARDEN | JOURNAL | By | Sir ALEXANDER DRAWCANSIR | KNT. CENSOR OF GREAT BRITAIN | (HENRY FIELDING) | EDITED BY | GERARD EDWARD JENSEN | VOLUME I [II] | [Cut] | NEW HAVEN: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS | LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD | OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS | MDCCCCXV

Vol. I: 3 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Dedication); [vii]-x pp. (Preface, Contents); 2 l. (List of Illustrations, Half-title); 368 pp. with 8 plates including frontispiece. Vol. II: 2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); [v]-vi pp. (Contents); 2 l. (List of Illustrations, Half-title); 293 pp. with 4 plates including frontispiece. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ . In Yale.

1918

THE | TRAGEDY OF TRAGEDIES | OR | THE LIFE AND DEATH OF | TOM THUMB THE GREAT | WITH THE ANNOTATIONS OF | H. SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS | BY | HENRY FIELDING | EDITED BY | JAMES T. HILLHOUSE | [Cut] | NEW HAVEN: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS | LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD | OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS | MDCCCCXVIII

4 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Dedication, Preface, Contents, Illustrations); 223 pp. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 8 $\frac{1}{16}$ . In Yale.

Contains a reprint of the first edition of *Tom Thumb*, the additions made in the second edition, the preface to the second edition, and the text of the first edition of *The Tragedy of Tragedies*.

II

## UNCERTAIN OR DOUBTFUL AUTHORSHIP

1732

SELECT | COMEDIES | OF Mr. DE MOLIERE. | FRENCH and ENGLISH. | IN EIGHT VOLUMES. | With a FRONTISPICE to each | COMEDY. | To which is Prefix'd a curious Print of the Author, | with his LIFE in French and English. | — | Hic meret æra liber Sosiis: hic & mare transit. | Et longum noto scriptori prorogat ævum. Horat. | — | LONDON: | Printed for JOHN WATTS, at the Printing-

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Office | in *Wild-Court* near *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*. | — | MDCC-  
XXXII.

8 vols. 6½ x 3¾. Portrait and 17 plates.

Published Dec. 8, 1732 (Adv. in C. Johnson's *Caelia*, 1733). In Yale.

Fielding probably shared in this translation with Henry Baker and James Miller. He had in his library the French ed. of 1718, 8 vols. See this biography, vol. I, pp. 144-145.

1737

A Rehearsal of KINGS; or The Projecting Gingerbread BAKER, with the unheard of Catastrophe of *Macplunderkan*, King of Roguomania, and the ignoble Fall of Baron *Tromperland*, King of Clouts. . . . To which will be added a new Farce of One Act, called Sir PEEVY PET.

First performed at the Haymarket, March 9, 1737 (*Grub-st. Journal*, Feb. 24). Never printed.

*A Rehearsal of Kings* was an old farce, which may have been reworked by Fielding. Perhaps *Sir Peevy Pet* was written by Eliza Haywood.

1739

THE | MYTHOLOGY | AND | FABLES | OF THE | ANCIENTS, | Explain'd from | HISTORY. | By the Abbé BANIER, | Member of the ROYAL ACADEMY of | INSCRIPTIONS and BELLES-LETTRES. | — | VOL. I. [II., III., IV.] | — | *Translated from the Original FRENCH.* | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, at Buchanan's-Head, against | St. Clement's-Church in the Strand. | M.DCC.XXXIX. [M.DCC.XL, M.DCC.XL.]

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xxiii (Advertisément, The Author's Preface, Contents); 583 pp.; [1] p. (Books printed for A. Millar). Vol. II: 6 p. l. (Books printed for and Sold by A. Millar, Title, 2d Title, Contents); 619 pp. Vol. III: 5 p. l. (Title, 2d Title, Contents); 545 pp.; [1] p. (Books printed for and Sold by A. Millar). Vol. IV, dated 1741 (*London Mag.* Feb. 1741, p. 104), wanting in Yale. 7½ x 4¾. In Brit. Mus.

Advertised in *Jacobite's Journal*, Jan. 9, 1748, and later, probably for a new ed. Referred to in *Jacobite's Journal*, Jan. 30, 1748, as "the most useful, instructive and entertaining Book extant." On Feb. 20, 1748, Fielding draws a parallel between the origin of fables and the origin of Jacobite doctrines. Referred to in *Tom Jones*, Bk. XII, Ch. 1, as "a work of great erudition and of equal judgment." Apparently Fielding had a personal interest in the work; he may have supervised the translation or a revision.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1740

AN | APOLOGY | For the LIFE of Mr. T. . . . . C. . . . ., Comedian. | BEING A | Proper Sequel | TO THE | APOLOGY | For the LIFE of | Mr. Colley Cibber, Comedian. | WITH | An Historical View of the STAGE to the | Present YEAR. | — | Supposed to be written by HIMSELF. | In the *Stile* and *Manner* of the POET LAUREAT. | — | [9 lines of quotation] | COLLEY CIBBER's Life, p. 26, 27 | — *Sequiturque Patrem non possibus Aequis.* | — | LONDON: | Printed for J. MECELL at the *King's-Arms* in | *Fleet Street*. 1740. [Price Two Shillings.]

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-viii (Dedication: "To a Certain Gentleman"); 144 pp.  $7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{1}{8}$ .

Published July, 1740 (*Gent. Mag.* July, p. 360). In Yale.

Dublin, 1741. In Yale.

More than once attributed to Fielding. Probably Fielding had a hand in this burlesque biography.

THE | MILITARY HISTORY | of | CHARLES XII. | King of SWEDEN, | Written by the express Order of his Majesty, | By M. GUSTAVUS ALDERFELD, CHAMBERLAIN to the KING. | To which is added, | An exact Account of the Battle of Pultowa, | with a JOURNAL of the KING'S | Retreat to Bender. | Illustrated with *Plans of the Battles and Sieges.* | Translated into English. | In THREE VOLUMES. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Printed for J. and P. KNAPTON in *Ludgate-Street*: | J. HODGES upon *London-Bridge*: A. MILLAR oppo- | site to St. Clement's Church in the *Strand*; and | J. NOURSE without *Temple-Bar*. 1740.

Vol. I: 2 p. l. (Title, 2d Title); xv pp. (Preface); [1] p. (Advertisement); 338 pp.; [2] pp. (Advertisement). Front. (port.); 5 fold. plans. Vol. II: 2 p. l. (Half-title; Title); 388 pp. Vol. III: 1 p. l. (Title); 334 pp. 1 fold. plan.  $8\frac{3}{8} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ .

2d title of vol. I and titles of vols. II-III have Vol. I., II., III. in place of the words, "In three volumes."

Published Oct. 16, 1740 (*Champion*, Oct. 16). In Boston Athenæum.

Fielding supervised and probably had some direct part in this translation; see receipt of March 10, 1739, as given in this biography, vol. I, p. 284.

Abridged with title:

THE | GENUINE HISTORY | of | CHARLES XII. King of SWEDEN: | CONTAINING | All his MILITARY ACTIONS; | WITH | A

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

more particular Account of the Battle of *Pultowa*, and of | his Majesty's Retreat to *Bender* in *Turkey*, than was ever | yet published. | — | WRITTEN BY | M. GUSTAVUS ADLERFELD, | Chamberlain to the King, and by his Majesty's express Order: | And now translated into *English*, | By JAMES FORD, Esq; | — | Illustrated with the Effigies of the King, and several Plans of the | Battles and Sieges. | = | LONDON: | Printed and Sold by the Booksellers in Town and Country. | — | MDCCXLII.

On the relation between the two editions, see this biography, vol. I, pp. 285-286.

1741

THE | *PLAIN TRUTH*: | A | DIALOGUE | BETWEEN | Sir COURTELY JOBBER, | Candidate for the Borough of GUZZLEDOWN, | AND | TOM TELLTRUTH, | School-Master and Freeman in the said | Borough. | — | By the Author of the *Remarkable Queries* in the | CHAMPION, October 7. | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. HUGGON-SON, in *Sword and Buckler* | Court, on *Ludgate-Hill*. MDCCXLII. | (Price Six-Pence.)

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 24 pp. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 4 $\frac{7}{8}$ .

Advertised in the *Champion*, May 19, 1741. In Yale.

The Remarkable Queries in the *Champion* for Oct. 7 had previously been published in the *Champion* for June 14, 1740. They are signed B. T. but the *Daily Gazetteer* of Oct. 9 implies that Fielding was the author. Authorship doubtful.

2d ed. London, 1741. 1 p. l. (Title); [3]-23 pp.; [1] p. (Advertisement). 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ . In the Advertisement is listed a three penny edition of *The Crisis*. A Sermon. In Yale.

1746

*An EPILOGUE*, | *Designed to be spoken by Mrs. WOFFINGTON*, in the | *Character of a Volunteer*.

Published in *The True Patriot*, no. 17, Feb. 18-25, 1746. Spoken at Drury-Lane, March 13, 1746, and at other times (Genest, *English Stage*, vol. IV, pp. 180, 183). Reprinted, with variations in *The Foundling Hospital for Wit*, no. 3, June 1746, pp. 24-25. Probably by Fielding.

1748 ?

Charge to the Jury on the Tryal of A. B. C. Price One Shilling.

Advertised as by Henry Fielding in Sarah Fielding's *Cleopatra and Octavia*, 2d ed. 1758. No copy known; nor does the title (probably a sub-title) appear

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

in lists of books given in the magazines of the period. For a similar pamphlet see the following item and this biography, vol. II, pp. 94-95.

1749

A Genuine COPY of the | TRYAL | OF | *J-----P-----l*, Esq; &c. | Commonly call'd, | *E----- of E-----*. | The reputed AUTHOR of a Pamphlet, | entituled, *An Examination of the | Principles, &c. of the two B-----rs.* | TRY'D | On Wednesday the 22d of February, at the | *OLD-BAILEY*. | For several HIGH CRIMES and MISDE- | MEANOURS. | On a Special COMMISSION of Oyer and | Terminer. | Directed to the Right Honourable the Lord | Chief Justice *Truth*, the Lord Chief Ba- | ron *Reason*, and Mr. Justice *Honesty*. | Taken in Short-hand by a Barrister at Law, and Revis'd | and Publish'd by Order of the Judges. | — | *Belial, in Act more graceful and humane, | A fairer Person lost not Heaven; he seem'd | For Dignity compos'd and high Exploit: | But all was false and hollow; tho' his Tongue | Dropt Manna— | — | London: Printed for R. FREEMAN, near Ludgate.*

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 52 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  x  $4\frac{13}{16}$ .

Published March 25, 1749 (*London Mag.* March, p. 148). In Yale.

Attributed to Fielding by *Old England*, March 25, 1749. A severe arraignment of John Perceval, 2d Earl of Egmont, for deserting the Pelhams, "the two brothers." Probably written by an imitator of Fielding.

1752

An Act for the better preventing Thefts and Robberies, and for regulating Places of publick Entertainment, and punishing Persons keeping disorderly Houses. —Statutes at Large, 25 Geo. II, 36.

This statute received the royal assent, March 26, 1752. On Fielding's probable authorship, see this biography, vol. II, p. 280.

THESAVRVS | LINGVÆ LATINÆ | COMPENDIARIVS: | or, | A Compendious | DICTIONARY | of the | Latin Tongue: | Designed chiefly for the | Use of the British Nations. | In two Volumes. | . . . | By ROBERT AINSWORTH. | . . . | The Fourth Edition, with Additions and | Improvements. | . . . | LONDON, | . . . | MDCCLII.

2 vols.  $10\frac{3}{4}$  x  $8\frac{1}{2}$ . In Brit. Mus.

Preface, p. xxii, signed: William Young. In Fielding's library, no. 419, there was a copy of Ainsworth's Dictionary, 1746, "with MSS notes by Mr

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Fielding.' Probable Fielding assisted Young to some extent in the preparation of this edition of Ainsworth.

1755

M. BENI. HEDERICI | LEXICON | MANVALE GRÆCVM | ... | *Hanc TERTIAM EDITIONEM, ut prioribus auctior prodiret atque emendatior, curavit | — | GVLIELMVS YOVNG. | = | LONDINI: | ... | M.DCC.LV.*

10 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ . In Yale.

In Fielding's library, no. 258, was *Hederici . . . Lexicon Græcum* 4to. London, 1732. "Cum notis MSS Henr. Fielding." On the likelihood that Fielding read Hedericus in 1752-1753 with a view to collaborating with Young on the third edition, see this biography, vol. III, pp. 80-82.

## III

### WORKS ERRONEOUSLY ATTRIBUTED TO FIELDING

"There are few crimes of which I should have been more ashamed than of some writings laid to my charge."

1725

On Jonathan Wild. (In *Mist's Weekly Journal*, June, 12, 19, 1725.)

Attributed to Fielding by Alfred J. Robbins (*Notes and Queries*, ser. 11, vol. II, pp. 261-263). Fielding could not have written the papers. See J. Paul de Castro in *Notes and Queries*, ser. 12, vol. II, p. 441.

ca. 1730

### The HISTORY of THOMAS HICKATHRIFT.

"To F . . . . G names unknown—to him have come | The fame of Hickathrift and brave Tom Thumb." (*Gent. Mag.* Nov. 1731; quoted from *Grub-st. Journal*, Nov. 18.

In *Fraser's Mag.* April, 1846, vol. XXXIII, pp. 495-502, Thackeray quotes freely from *The History of Thomas Hickathrift*, and says, "This must be surely Fielding." See also Lawrence, *Henry Fielding*, London, 1855, p. 38 note.

Thackeray's quotations were taken from the story as told in *Gammer Gurton's Famous Histories of Sir Guy of Warwick, Sir Bevis of Hampton, Tom Hickathrift, Friar Bacon, Robin Hood, and the King and the Cobler. Newly Revised and Amended by Ambrose Merton, Gent. . . . Westminster*. [1846].

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambrose Merton was the pseudonym of W. J. Thoms, who based his narrative on *A Pleasant and Delightful History of Thomas Hickathrift* [1780 ?]. This chapbook was in turn largely derived from *The Pleasant History of Thomas Hicka-Thrift*, antedating 1703 (reprinted and edited by E. L. Gomme for the Villon Society in 1885). There is no evidence that Fielding ever bore a hand in any revision of this old story. The lines in the *Gent. Mag.*, however, raise the presumption that Fielding may have written a farce on Hickathrift about 1730; but of this farce there is now no trace.

1731

THE | BATTLE | OF THE | POETS; | OR, THE | Contention for the  
LAUREL. | . . . | MDCCXXXI.

For full title and bibliographical description, see below, p. 350.

Published Dec. 1730.

Attributed to Fielding in *The Candidates for the Bays*, 1730: "By the valiant T--T---- and his *Battle of Poets*." Probably written by Thomas Cooke.

1735

A Hymn to the Mob. London, 1735.

Attributed to Fielding by Watt in *Bibliotheca Britannica*. The poem was written by Daniel Defoe and first published in 1715.

The Man of Taste: or, the Guardians. A Comedy. London, 1735.

Attributed to Fielding by Watt in *Bibliotheca Britannica* and in the old catalogue of the Brit. Mus. The play was adapted from Molière by James Miller.

1737

AN | ESSAY | on | CONVERSATION. | = | [2 lines of quotation] | HORAT. | = | LONDON: | Printed for L. GILLIVER and J. CLARKE, at *Homer's Head* in *Fleet-street*, and at their Shop in *Westminster-Hall*. M,DCC,XXXVII. Price 1 s.

1 p. l. (Title); 19 pp. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Published Feb. 1737 (*Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 128). In Yale.

This poem of unknown authorship, confounded with Fielding's prose essay of the same title in the *Miscellanies*, is often listed with Fielding's works in sale catalogues.

The Golden Rump.

Never performed nor printed. This farce, attributed by Horace Walpole and many others to Fielding, was not written by him. On the authorship, see this biography, vol. I, pp. 226-229.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1741

Letter to Brother Scribe, the Editor, from Hercules Vinegar, and an essay entitled: "Female Oratory, or the true and genuine Speech of Abigail Trite, An Undertaker's Maid." As *The Champion* has failed, Hercules Vinegar offers his services to *The Daily Gazetteer*. (In *Daily Gazetteer*, March 30, 1741.)

Letter to Ralph Freeman, Esqr, from Hercules Vinegar. "From our Apartment, the Sign of the Three Red Herrings and Halfpenny Loaf, Vauxhall." (In *Daily Gazetteer*, Sept. 18, 1741.)

"The Interview of a Conversation which lately happened in Mix'd Company at the Globe Tavern." H. Vinegar is represented as one of the speakers. (In *Daily Gazetteer*, Sept. 23, 1741.)

"A Third Interview at the Globe." Hercules Vinegar is again a speaker. (In *Daily Gazetteer*, Oct. 30, 1741.)

The first two of the above items were attempts to make it appear that Fielding, while conducting *The Champion*, was writing for a ministerial organ at the same time. In the Preface to the *Miscellanies*, London, 1743, vol. I, p. xxvi (i.e. xxxvi), Fielding says, "the *Gazetteer*, in which I never had the honour of inserting a single word."

1742

BLAST upon BLAST | and | LICK for LICK, | OR, A | New Lesson | for | P—pe. | A Parody on the Fourth Chapter of | Genesis. | By Capt. H—S Vinegar. | LONDON: | Printed for W. WEBB, near St. Paul's: and | sold by the Booksellers and Pamphlet- | Shops of London and Westminster. | 1742.

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-8 pp. Folio.

Published August, 1742 (*Gent. Mag.* Aug. p. 448). In Brit. Mus.

Attributed to Fielding by Horace Walpole in letter to Mann, Aug. 1742 (*Letters*, ed. by Toynbee, vol. I, pp. 274-276). This is an attack upon Pope, such as Fielding could never have written.

The CUDGEL, | OR, A | Crab-tree Lecture. | To the Author of | The DUNCIAD. | By Hercules Vinegar, Esq; | . . . | LONDON: | Printed for the Author, and Sold at his House, the *Crab-Tree*, | in Vinegar-yard, near Drury-Lane. [Price 1 s.] | MDCCXLII.

1 p. l. (Title); 56 pp. 8vo.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published August, 1742 (*Gent. Mag.* Aug. p. 448). In Brit. Mus. Not by Fielding.

A | LETTER | TO A | *NOBLE LORD*, | To whom alone it Belongs. | Occasioned by a Representation at the | THEATRE ROYAL in *Drury-Lane*, | of a FARCE, called *Miss Lucy in Town.* | — | [3 lines of quotation] | *Hor. de Arte Poet.* | — | *LONDON:* | Printed for T. COOPER, at the *Globe* in | *Pater-noster-Row.* | *Mdccxlii.*

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); 20 pp.  $7\frac{7}{16} \times 4\frac{9}{16}$ .

Published Dec. 1742 (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. p. 664; also *London Mag.* Dec. p. 626). In Yale.

Attributed to Fielding by Lawrence in *Henry Fielding*, London, 1855, p. 168. Not by Fielding.

### 1743

A Particular | ACCOUNT | Of CARDINAL FLEURY'S | JOURNEY to the other WORLD, | and his | Tryal at the Tribunal of MINOS. | Wherein Several | Secret Transactions | Relating to the Affairs of Europe | During his Administration | Are brought to Light and Canvassed. | With a Curious Description of the | Infernal Regions and their Inhabitants. | By DON QUEVEDO, Junior, | Secretary to ÆACUS, one of the puisne Judges | of the Infernal Court. | LONDON: | Printed for W. WEBB, near St. Paul's | 1743.

1 p. l. (Title); 78 pp. 8vo.

Published April, 1743 (*Gent. Mag.* April, p. 224; also *London Mag.* April, p. 208). In Brit. Mus. Though not by Fielding, it may have been suggested by *A Journey from this World to the Next*.

THE | CAUSIDICADE. | A Panegyri-Satiri-Serio-Comic-Dramatical | POEM. | ON THE | STRANGE Resignation, and Stranger-Promotion. | — | — *Difficile est vulpi Sociam dicere vulpem.* Tib. | — *Ridentem dicere verum | Quid vetat?* — *Hor.* | — | By PORCUPINUS PELAGIUS | — | *LONDON:* | Printed for M. COOPER, in *Pater-noster Row*, 1743. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title, Dramatis Personæ); 29 pp.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ .

Published June, 1743 (*Gent. Mag.* June, p. 336). 2d ed., 1743, in Yale.

In his preface to *David Simple* Fielding denies being the author of this “infamous poultry libel.” Authorship unknown, but may have been Macnamara Morgan, of Lincoln’s Inn, died 1762 (*European Mag.* vol. XXIII, p. 253; also *Notes and Queries*, Aug. 1, 1857, ser. 2, vol. IV, p. 94).

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1744

THE | ADVENTURES | OF | DAVID SIMPLE: | Containing | An ACCOUNT of his TRAVELS | Through the | CITIES of LONDON and | WESTMINSTER. | In the Search of | A REAL FRIEND. | — | By a LADY. | — | IN TWO VOLUMES. | — | VOL. I. [II.] | = | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite Katharine- | street, in the Strand. | — | M.DCC.XLIV.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-x pp. (Advertisement to the Reader; Contents); 278 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); 322 pp.  $6\frac{3}{4}$  x  $3\frac{1}{2}$ . Title of vol. II does not include the words, "In two volumes."

Published May, 1744 (*Gent. Mag.* May, p. 288; also *London Mag.* May, p. 260). In Brit. Mus.

Attributed to Henry Fielding on its appearance, but denied by him in the preface to the 2d edition. French translation as by Henry Fielding in vols. XVIII-XX of *Œuvres Complettes de M. Fielding*, Paris, 1791. In Yale; Paris, 1804. In Yale. Published by G. Virtue, London, 1822, with engraved title and 7 plates, under the title "Adventures in Search of a real Friend . . . by Henry Fielding, Esqr"; omits preface of the 2d ed. but has a biographical sketch of Henry Fielding. In Yale.

Written by Sarah Fielding, who received some literary advice from her brother while she was engaged upon the book.

1746

A SCHEME for raising a large Sum of Money for | the Use of the Government, by laying a Tax on Mes- | sage-Cards and Notes. | Signed: Descartes. (In *The Museum*, no. 2, April 12, 1746; also in *Works of Horace Walpole*, London, 1798, vol. I, pp. 132-139.)

"You remember a paper in *The Museum* on Message Cards wh<sup>ch</sup> he [Walpole] told me was Fielding's, & asked my Opinion about it: it was his own." (*Letters of Thomas Gray*, ed. Tovey, London, 1900, p. 133.)

1747

AN | APOLOGY | For the Conduct of a late celebrated | second-rate MINISTER, from the | Year 1729, at which Time he | commenc'd *Courtier*, till within | a few weeks of his Death, in | 1746. | Giving a clear View of his real *Prin- | ciples* and *Design*, and containing | many curious and interesting Par- | ticulars, relative to the Times and | to *Persons* in the highest Stations. | — | Written by himself and found among his Papers. | — | *Trahit sua quenque voluptas.* | = | LONDON: | Printed for W. WEBB, in *Paternoster-Row*. | (Price One-Shilling.)

AVVENTURES  
DE  
RODERICK RANDOM;  
Par FIELDING.

---

*TOME PREMIER.*

---



A PARIS,

Au Bureau du Journal de PERLET, rue  
Saint-André-des-Arts, N°. 41;  
Et chez OUVRIER, libraire, même adresse

---

1797.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-50 pp.  $7\frac{5}{8} \times 4\frac{7}{8}$ .

Published Dec. 1747 (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. pp. 574, 596). In Yale.

Attributed to Fielding in *The Patriot Analized*, Feb. 1748, pp. 36-38, though Fielding had replied to it on Dec. 24, 1747.

1748

THE | ADVENTURES | OF | RODERICK RANDOM | [1 line of quotation from *Horace*] | In Two VOLUMES. | VOL. I. [II.] | LONDON: | Printed for J. OSBORNE in *Pater-noster-Row*. | MDCCXLVIII.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xxiii pp. (Preface, Contents); 324 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); iii-xii pp. (Contents); 366 pp.

Lady Montagu writing to the Countess of Bute, June 23, 1754, says, "I guessed R. Random to be his, [Fielding's] though without his name" (*Letters*, London, 1837, vol. III, p. 93).

French translation as by Fielding, Londres, J. Nourse, 1751. In *Bibl. Nat.*, Paris; Amsterdam, 1762; Paris, 1797, 4 vols., as vols. XI-XIV of *Œuvres Complettes de M. Fielding*. In Yale; Paris, 1804. In Yale.

1749

THE | HISTORY | OF | TOM JONES | THE | FOUNDLING, | IN HIS | MARRIED STATE. | — | — *Utile dulci.* | = | LONDON: | Printed for J. ROBINSON, at the *Golden Lion* in | *Ludgate-Street*. | — | MDCCCL.

6 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable Elizabeth, Countess of Marchmont," Preface, Contents); 323 pp.  $6\frac{5}{16} \times 4$ .

Published Nov. 1749 (*Gent. Mag.* Nov. 1749, p. 528; also *London Mag.* Nov. p. 532; *Monthly Review*, Nov. pp. 25-26). In Yale.

Although the author in his preface states that Fielding did not write the book, it was included in the Hamburg translation of *Tom Jones*, 1758-59, as vol. VII (dated 1755). In Yale.

A Broadside signed: "Captain Hercules Vinegar," put out during the contested election in Nov. 1749 (*Gent. Mag.* Nov. p. 521). See this biography, vol. II, p. 238.

1751

THE | HISTORY | OF | Pompey the Little: | OR, THE | LIFE and ADVENTURES | OF A | LAP-DOG. | — | — *gressumque Canes comitantur berilem.* | VIR. *Æn.* | — *mutato nomine de te* | *Fabula narratur.* *Hor.* | = | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* | in *Paternoster Row*. | MDCCCLI.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1 p. l. (Title); iii-viii pp. (Contents); 272 pp. front.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{8}$ .

Published Feb. 1751 (*Gent. Mag.* Feb. p. 95; also *London Mag.* Feb. p. 96).

In Yale.

Attributed to Fielding in *Letters of Lady Luxborough to Wm. Shenstone*, London, 1775, p. 265.

Written by Francis Coventry. 3d ed. London, 1752, has dedication to Henry Fielding, Esq; pp. iii-xii. In Yale.

As in "An Essay on the New Species of Writing," Fielding is said to "stand foremost in this species of composition." See this biography, vol. II, p. 136; and vol. III, p. 79.

The Universal Register Office. Signed: Z. Z. (In *London Daily Advertiser*, June 3, 1751.)

This and other letters so signed, have been attributed to Henry Fielding. Probably written by John Fielding.

An Examination of Glastonbury Water. Signed: Z. Z. (In *London Daily Advertiser*, Aug. 31, 1751.)

Attributed to "J——e F——g" by *Gent. Mag.* Sept. 1751, pp. 416-417; to Henry Fielding by Lawrence in *Henry Fielding*, London, 1855, pp. 288-289; and by Dobson in *Henry Fielding*, London, 1883, pp. 142-143. Probably written by John Fielding.

THE | HISTORY | OF | Miss Betsy Thoughtless, | In FOUR VOLUMES. | VOL. I. [II., III., IV.] | [Cut] | LONDON. | Printed by T. GARDNER, and sold at his | Printing-Office at Cowley's-Head, facing St. | Clement's Church, in the Strand; and by all | Booksellers in Town and Country. | — | M,D,CC,LI.

Vol. I: 1 p. l. (Title); iv pp. (Contents); 288 pp. Vol. II: 1 p. l. (Title); iv pp. (Contents); 287 pp. Vol. III: 1 p. l. (Title); iv pp. (Contents); 288 pp. Vol. IV: 1 p. l. (Title); iv pp. (Contents); 312 pp.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ .

Published Oct. 1751 (*Gent. Mag.* Oct. p. 479). In Yale.

Refers bitterly to Fielding in vol. I, pp. 76-77. Translated into German as: Geschichte des Fräulein Elisabeth Thoughtless, von dem Verfasser der Begebenheiten des Thomas Jones beschrieben. Leipzig, 1754; Berlin, 1765. Reviewed by Lessing in *Vossische Zeitung*, Oct. 3, 1754, as a translation of a novel by "the famous Fielding." Written by Eliza Haywood.

1752

A Faithful | NARRATIVE | of the | Base and Inhuman Arts | that were lately practiced upon the | BRAIN | of | HABBAKKUK HILDING, | Justice, Dealer, and Chapman, | Who now lies at his

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

House in *Covent-Garden*, in a | deplorable State of Lunacy; a dreadful monument of | *false Friendship* and *Delusion*. | BY DRAW-  
CANSIR ALEXANDER, | *Fencing-Master* and *Philomath*. | — | —*tribus  
anticyris caput insanabile*. | I wage not war with *Bedlam* and the  
*Mint*. | — | London: | Printed for J. SHARP, near Temple-Bar. |  
MDCCLII. | (Price Six Pence.)

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-24 pp. 8vo.

Published Jan. 15, 1752 (*London Daily Advertiser*, Jan. 15). In Brit. Mus.  
Attributed to Fielding by Watt, in *Bibliotheca Britannica*. Written by  
Smollett.

A Speech made in the Censorial Court of Sir Alexander Draw-  
cansir, Monday 6th June, 1752. Concerning a late Act of Parlia-  
ment. Printed for the Author. Price 6 d. 4 to.

Advertised in *General Advertiser*, June 27, 1752. No copy known.

Attributed to Fielding by Godden in *Henry Fielding*, London, 1910, p. 259;  
and by others. Not written by Fielding. It is to be noted that the title does  
not claim that the speech was made by Drawcansir, but only in his court.  
Perhaps the author was Bonnell Thornton. See this biography, vol. II, pp.  
405-407.

THE | INSPECTOR | IN THE | SHADES. | A | NEW DIALOGUE | In  
the Manner of *LUCIAN*. | — | [3 lines of quotation] | PHÆDRUS. |  
— | *LONDON*: | Printed for J. SWAN, in the *Strand*, near | *North-  
umberland-House*. MDCCLII.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title); [3]-22 pp.  $7\frac{3}{16} \times 4\frac{7}{16}$ .

Published July 13, 1752 (*London Daily Advertiser*, July 16; *Monthly  
Review*, July, p. 75). In Yale.

“Because this is in imitation of Lucian’s style and directed against Hill,  
it seems probable that the *inspiration*, at least may have come from Fielding”  
(Jensen, *Covent-Garden Journal*, New Haven, 1915, vol. I, p. 76 note). Certainly not written by Fielding.

THE | ADVENTURER | . . . | [2 lines of quotation from *Virgil*] |  
[Cut] | *LONDON*: | Printed for J. PAYNE, at *POPE’S HEAD*, in |  
*PATER-NOSTER Row* | [Nov. 7, 1752-March 5, 1754]

To this periodical, edited by John Hawkesworth, it was supposed at first  
that Henry and Sarah Fielding were contributors. See this biography, vol. II,  
p. 424. In Yale.

The *Public Advertiser*, Dec. 1, 1752, *et seq.*

*The London Daily Post and General Advertiser* was reorganized under this

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

new title. In the *Monthly Review*, Feb. 1753, is advertised "A Scheme for a new PUBLIC ADVERTISER. Printed for Justice Fail-paper"; and the *Review* says "it is intended to ridicule Mr. Fielding and others who are to be concerned in a daily news-paper." There are no indications of Fielding's hand except as mentioned in this biography, vol. II, pp. 428-429; and vol. III, p. 324.

A | LETTER | FROM | HENRY WOODWARD, | COMEDIAN, |  
The MEANEST of all Characters; | (See INSPECTOR, No. 524.) | TO |  
Dr. JOHN HILL, | INSPECTOR-GENERAL of Great-Britain, | The  
GREATEST of all Characters; | (See all the INSPECTORS.) | — | *I do  
remember an Apothecary — | — whom late I noted | In tatter'd  
Weeds — | Culling of Simples. — | SHAKESPEAR.* | — | LONDON: |  
Printed for M. COOPER, in Pater-noster-row. | (Price Sixpence.)  
| — | M.DCC.LII.

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-22 pp.  $7\frac{1}{16}$  x  $4\frac{7}{16}$ .

Published Dec. 1752. In Yale. Three editions within a few days (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. p. 587).

Attributed Dec. 1752 to Fielding by Sampson Edwards in *A Letter to Mr. Woodward on his Triumph over the Inspector*. "It is not improbable that this letter was from the pen of Fielding" (Lawrence, *Henry Fielding*, London, 1855, p. 314). The 2d edition in Yale has inscribed in a contemporary hand "This Pamphlet is suppos'd to have been wrote by Mr. Garrick and Mr. Fielding." "Very possibly, although the word-usage therein is not Fielding's" (Jensen, *Covent-Garden Journal*, New Haven, 1915, vol. I, pp. 87-88). Probably written by Woodward without assistance.

1754

THE | HISTORY | OF | Sir Harry Herald | AND | Sir Edward  
Haunch. | — | By HENRY FIELDING, Esq. | — | [Cut] | = |  
DUBLIN: | Printed by JAMES HOEY, at the *Mercury* | in Skinner-  
Row. | MDCCLV.

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-274 pp.; [2] pp. (Books printed and Sold by James Hoey).  $6\frac{5}{8}$  x 4.

Published Dec. 1754 in London, by Noble, in three vols. (*Gent. Mag.* Dec. 1754, p. 581). No copy of London edition known. Dublin edition in Yale. Author unknown.

1760

The Life and Adventures of a Cat. By the late Mr. Fielding. 12 mo. Price 2 s. 6 d. Minors.

Published April, 1760 (*London Mag.* April, p. 224). No copy known.

*The Critical Review*, May, 1760, vol. IX, p. 420, says, "A worthy inhabitant

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

of Grub-street would palm himself upon us for the identical Henry Fielding, Esq; of facetious memory."

1767

Die Geraubte Einsiedlerinn, oder Ophelia, aus dem Englischen des Herrn Fielding. In two Parts, Berlin, 1767.

Perhaps based upon Sarah Fielding's *History of Ophelia*, 1758. In Germany Sarah Fielding's works were generally attributed to Henry Fielding. See Augustus Wood, *Einfluss Fieldings auf die deutsche Literatur*, Yokohama, 1895, p. 18.

Berlin, 1772.

1768

Mémoires du Chevalier de Kilpar, traduits ou imités de l'Anglois de M. Fielding, par M. D. C. D. Paris, 1768.

2 vols. 12mo. In Bibl. Nat., Paris, where it is said to be translated by L. L. J. Gain de Montagnac.

2d ed. Paris, 1769. In Brit. Mus.; Frankfurt, 1769 (Augustus Wood, *Einfluss Fieldings auf die deutsche Literatur*, Yokohama, 1895, p. 18).

Geschichte | des | Ritters von Kilpar. | Aus dem Englischen | des Herrn Fielding. | — | [Cut] | — | Leipzig, 1769. | in Gleditschens Handlung.

5 p. l. (Title, Dedication, Introduction); 350 pp. 6 $\frac{1}{8}$  x 4. Introduction signed: Gottfried Rudolph Widmer. In Yale.

Published also with titles:

Robinson der Wiener oder seltsame Abentheuer des Ritters von Kilpar: aus d. Engl. des Fielding übersetzt. Wien, 1799; Wien, 1805.

Das Wiener Robinson od. Abentheuer des Ritters von Kilpar. Leipzig, n. d.

No English tale with this title is known. Called a fraud in Joseph Texte, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Cosmopolitan Spirit in Literature*, London, 1899, p. 146 note.

1789

Les Malheurs du Sentiment traduit de l'Anglois de M. FIELDING. Sur la troisieme edition; par M. Mercier. Genève, 1789.

2 vols. 12mo. In Brit. Mus.

This is the translation, apparently, of *The Curse of Sentiment*, published anonymously. Mercier may be Louis Sébastien Mercier, the dramatist.

1805

La Roue de Fortune, ou l'Heritière de Beauchamp, par Fielding. Traduit de l'Anglais par Ch. Def\* \*\*, Paris, 1819.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

3 vols. In Brit. Mus.

This is a translation of *The Wheel of Fortune*, London, 1805, a novel by Eliza Lake. The translator was A. J. B. Defauconpret.

Fielding's own productions were rarely attributed to anyone else. But *The Masquerade* was published in the *Works of Dr. John Arbuthnot*. See *The Masquerade* in this bibliography.

## IV

### DRAMAS ON FIELDING OR HIS WORKS

1730

THE | BATTLE | OF THE | POETS; | OR, THE | Contention for the LAUREL. | As it is now Acting | At the NEW THEATRE in the Hay-market; | introduced as an intire New ACT to the Comical Tragedy of TOM THUMB. | — | Written by SCRIBLERUS TERTIUS. | — | Now, Bavius, take the Poppy from thy Brow, | And place it here! here all ye Heroes bow! | This, this is He, foretold by ancient Rhimes, | Th' Augustus born to bring Saturnian Times. | DUNCIAD. | — | [Cut] | = | LONDON: | Printed for W. TROTT in Russel-Court by Drury- | Lane, and T. ASTLEY in St. Paul's Church-yard. | — | MDCCXXXI. | (Price Six-pence.)

4 p. l. (Half-title, Title, A new Prologue, Dramatis Personæ); [9]-24 pp. 7½ x 4¾. In Yale.

First performed Nov. 30, 1730. Published Dec. 17, 1730. Probably written by Thomas Cooke. See this biography, vol. I, pp. 95-97.

Dublin, 1731.

1733

THE | OPERA of OPERAS; | OR, | TOM THUMB the Great. | ALTER'D | From the LIFE and DEATH | OF | TOM THUMB the Great. | AND | Set to MUSICK after the ITALIAN Manner. | As it is Performing at the | NEW THEATRE in the Hay-Market. | = | LONDON: | Printed for WILLIAM RAYNER, Prisoner | in the KING'S-BENCH, and to be sold at the | THEATRE, and likewise at the Printing Office | in Marigold-Court, over-against the Fountain- | Tavern in the Strand. MDCCXXXIII. | [Price One Shilling.]

3 p. l. (Title, The Argument, Dramatis Personæ); [7]-44 pp. 7¾ x 4¾. Contains 33 songs.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

First performed May 31, 1733 (*Daily Post*, May 28).

Published June, 1733 (*Gent. Mag.* June, p. 331; also *London Mag.* June, p. 313). In Yale. Alterations probably made by Eliza Haywood and William Hatchett. Music by Thomas Arne.

THE | OPERA of OPERAS; | or, | TOM THUMB the GREAT. | Alter'd | From the LIFE and DEATH | of | TOM THUMB the GREAT. | And | Set to MUSICK after the Italian Manner. By Mr. Lampe. | As it is Perform'd | By His Majesty's Company of Comedians | at the | *Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*. | = | LONDON, | Printed: and Sold by J. ROBERTS in *Warwick-Lane*. | — | MDCCXXXIII. | [Price Six Pence.]

32 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  x  $4\frac{1}{4}$ . With 33 songs, but varying from the earlier edition. In New York Pub. Lib.

Revised Oct. 31, 1733, and put on at Drury-Lane Nov. 7 (*Daily Post*, Nov. 7).

Published Nov. (*Gent. Mag.* Nov. p. 611; also *London Mag.* Nov. p. 591). Text probably by the same as above. Music by John Frederick Lampe. Fielding had nothing to do with either version.

### 1748

A Dramatic Entertainment. On April 18, 1748 Samuel Foote exhibited Fielding on the stage at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket.

The satirical sketch or oration was never published. See this biography, vol. II, pp. 88-89.

### 1752

FUN: | A Parodi-tragi-comical | SATIRE. | As it was to have been perform'd at the | *Castle-Tavern, Pater-noster-Row*, | on | THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1752, | BUT | ~~Suppressed~~, | BY | A Special ORDER from the LORD-MAYOR | and COURT of ALDERMEN. | [Cut] | LONDON: | Sold by F. STAMPER in *Pope's-head Alley, Cornhill*; | and by all other Booksellers. MDCCCLII. | [Price One Shilling.]

1 p. l. (Title, Advertisement); iv pp. (Preface); [2] pp. (Prologue, Persons of the Drama); 40 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4}$  x 5.

Never performed. Published March 7, 1752 (*General Advertiser*, March 7). In Yale. See this biography, vol. II, pp. 407-410.

*Covent-Garden Theatre: or, PASQUIN turn'd DRAWCANSIR, Censor of Great Britain.* Written by Charles Macklin.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Performed at the Theatre Royal, Covent-Garden, April 8, 1752 (*Drury Lane Journal*, April 9). Never published. For playbill and performance, see this biography, vol. II, pp. 410-413.

1758

THE | UPHOLSTERER, | OR, | What NEWS? | A | FARCE | In  
TWO ACTS. | As it is Performed at the | THEATRE-ROYAL |  
IN | COVENT-GARDEN. | With ALTERATIONS and ADDITIONS |  
... | By Mr. MURPHY. | = | LONDON, Printed for P. VAILLANT,  
facing Southampton-Street, | in the *Strand*. | MDCCLXV. | [Price  
One Shilling.]

3 p. l. (Title, Prologue, Plays printed for Paul Vaillant, *Dramatis Personae*); 48 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ . In Yale.

First performed March 30, 1758. First published, April 1758 (*London Chronicle*, April 13-15). Alterations made in 1763.

Much of it taken from Fielding's *Coffee-House Politician*.

1761

THE | JEALOUS WIFE: | A | COMEDY. | As it is Acted at  
the | Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. | By GEORGE COLMAN,  
Esq. | *Servatâ semper LEGE et RATIONE*.—JUV. | = | LONDON: |  
... | MDCCLXI.

5 p. l. (Title, Dedication: "To the Right Honourable the Earl of Bath," Prologue, Advertisement, *Dramatis Personæ*); 109 pp.; [3] pp. (Epilogue, Advertisement).  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ .

First performed Feb. 12, 1761. Published, Feb. 1761 (*London Mag.* Feb. pp. 59-62, 168). In Yale.

Taken in part from *Tom Jones*.

1765

TOM JONES | COMEDIE LYRIQUE | EN TROIS ACTES. | Repré-  
sentée par les Comediens Italiens du Roy, pour la première fois | Le  
27 Fevrier 1765. Et remise avec des changements Le 30. Janvier  
1766. | DÉDIÉE | A S. A. S. MONSEIGNEUR | LE DUC REGNANT DES  
DEUX PONTS | Prince Palatin du Rhin, Duc de Baviere &c, &c. |  
Mis en Musique | PAR A. D. PHILIDOR. | *Les Paroles de Mr Poinsinet*.  
| Prix en blanc 18<sup>tt</sup> | *Les parties séparée 6<sup>tt</sup>* | Gravé par Le Sr  
Hue | A PARIS | Chez L' Auteur rue Mont-martre vis à vis le Cul  
de Sac S. Pierre. | Et aux adresses ordinaires de Musique. | Avec  
Privilege Du Roy. | Imprimée par Le Sr Monthuay.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

2 p. l. (Title, Dedication, Privilege); 172 pp.  $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ . Contains the music. In Yale.

The Privilege is dated 21 Juin, 1766.

In an earlier form, this piece may have been performed before the Court at Versailles on March 30, 1764, and published in Paris in 1765 (Carl Waldschmidt, *Die Dramatisierungen von Fielding's Tom Jones*, Wetzlar, 1906, p. 30).

"This opera is the first known instance of the employment of harmonies for strings in orchestral music" (F. A. Gevaert, *Nouveau Traité d'Instrumentation*, Paris, 1885, p. 41).

Paris, 1766, 60 pp.,  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ . In Yale; Paris, 1766, 103 pp. In New York Pub. Lib.; Paris, 1767; London, 1777. In Brit. Mus.; London, 1778. In Brit. Mus.; Dresden, 1766. In Brit. Mus.; Amsterdam, 1767; Copenhaque, 1769. In Yale; Avignon, 1772. In Brit. Mus.; Mannheim, 1772; Frankfurt, 1773; Paris, 1773. In Yale.

THOMAS JONES, | ein | Lustspiel von fünf Aufzügen, | nach der | Grundlage des Herrn Fielding, | von | J. H. Steffens, | Rector der Zellischen Schule. | [Cut] | = | Zelle, 1765. | bey George Conrad Gsellius, | Königl. privil. Buchhändler.

1 p. l. (Title, Personen); [3]-120 pp.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4$ . In Yale. 2d ed. Oels, 1796.

### 1767

Tom Jones. Ein Lustspiel von fünf Aufzügen nach dem Englischen Roman. Von Franz von Heufeld. . . . Wien, 1767. 8 vo.

Scene, the estate of Squire Western. 5 Acts. Described by Waldschmidt as above, pp. 57-68.

### 1769

TOM JONES, | a | COMIC OPERA : | As it is Performed at the | THEATRE-ROYAL | in | COVENT-GARDEN. | By JOSEPH REED. | [Cut] | LONDON, | Printed for BECKET and DE HONDT, in the Strand; and | RICHARDSON and URQUHART, at the Royal Exchange | MDCCLXIX.

3 p. l. (Title, Preface, Advertisement, Dramatis Personæ); 62 pp.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ .

First performed Jan. 14, 1769. The first run was for thirteen nights. See accounts of first performance in *London Chronicle*, Jan. 14-17; *Lloyd's Evening Post*, Jan. 13-16; and *St. James's Chronicle*, Jan. 14-17. See also *London Mag.* Jan. pp. 3-8, 42-43; and *Monthly Review*, Jan. pp. 65-68.

Published Jan. 1769. In Yale.

2d ed. London, 1769. 59 pp. In Yale; Dublin, 1769. In Yale.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1772

Squire Badger. A Burletta in two Parts, arranged and adapted with the music by Dr. Thomas Augustine Arne. 1772.

Svo. In Brit. Mus.

Performed at the Haymarket in 1772. The music of this piece was composed by Dr. Arne, who probably also wrote the words. It is taken from Fielding's *Don Quixote in England*. Listed in Baker, *Biographia Dramatica*, London, 1812, vol. III, p. 297; also E. Green, *Henry Fielding*, London, 1909, p. 19.

1773

THE | DUELLIST, | A COMEDY. | AS IT IS ACTED AT THE | THEATRE ROYAL | IN | COVENT GARDEN. | WRITTEN BY | W. KENRICK, LL. D. | LONDON: | PRINTED FOR T. EVANS, NEAR YORK BUILDINGS, | IN THE STRAND.

8 p. l. (Half-title, Epilogue, Title, Preface, Prologue, *Dramatis Personæ*); 80 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  x 4 $\frac{5}{8}$ . In Yale.

Performed and damned, Nov. 20, 1773 (*London Chronicle*, Nov. 20-23). Published, Nov. 26 (*London Chronicle*, Nov. 25-27).

Taken largely from Fielding's *Amelia*.

Three editions in 1773.

1775

The Sot, a Burletta, in two Parts, altered from Fielding. 1775.

Svo. In Brit. Mus.

Performed at the Haymarket in 1775. A rewriting of *Squire Badger*. Listed in Baker, *Biographia Dramatica*, London, 1812, vol. III, p. 290.

1778

Joseph Andrews. A Farce. By Samuel Jackson Pratt.

Performed at Drury-Lane for Mr. Bensley's Benefit, April 20, 1778 (*London Chronicle*, April 18-21). Never published. Listed in Baker, *Biographia Dramatica*, London, 1812, vol. II, p. 348.

1780

SONGS | IN THE | COMIC OPERA | OF | TOM THUMB the GREAT | As it is now performing at the | MICROCOSM | near Stephen's-Street. | DUBLIN: | Arthur Grueber | — | MDCC-LXXX. | —

1 p. l. (Title); [iii]-viii pp. (Address to the Audience by Punch, on the opening of the Microcosm, Prologue); [9]-31 pp.; [1] p. (Vaudeville, Chorus of All). Svo. In Brit. Mus.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Performed Oct. 3, 1780, at the Covent-Garden theatre, London.

Taken from Fielding and prepared for the stage by the author of *Midas* [Kane O'Hara] (*Public Advertiser*, Oct. 3-4, 1780). In three Acts. See *Gent. Mag.* Dec. 1780, p. 580; also Oulton, *History of the Theatres of London*, London, 1796, vol. I, p. 98. No London edition of 1780 is known. Allibone gives date 1780, but no place. Apparently the first London edition is the one described below.

### 1781

AIRS, DUETS, &c. | IN THE | COMIC OPERA | OF | TOM THUMB, | In Two Acts. | Performing at the | THEATRE-ROYAL | in | *Covent-Garden*. | LONDON: | Printed in the Year 1781.

1 p. l. (Title, The Drama); [5]-16 pp. 8vo. In Brit. Mus.

Published under various titles: London, 1794. In Yale; London, Barker [1805]. In Yale; London, Cawthorne, 1805. In Yale; London, 1806. In Yale; London, 1809. In Yale; London, 1811. In New York Pub. Lib.; London, 1815. In Brit. Mus.; London, [1822]. In Yale; New York, 1824. In Yale; London, 1824. In Brit. Mus.; London [1825]. In Yale; London, 1828. In Yale; London, 1830. In Yale; London, 1837. In Yale; London [1850]. In Yale.

### 1782

TOM JONES | *A LONDRES*, | COMÉDIE EN CINQ ACTES, EN VERS, | TIRÉE DU ROMAN DE FIELDING, | *Représentée, pour la première fois, par les Comédiens Italiens Ordinaires du Roi, le Mardi 22 Octobre* | 1782. | PAR M. DESFORGES. | — | Prix trente Sols. | — | [Cut] | *A PARIS*, | Chez F. J. BAUDOUIN. Imprimeur-Libraire, | rue de la Harpe, près Saint-Côme. | = | *M.DCC.-LXXXII.*

1 p. l. (Title, Personnages); [5]-88 pp.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ . In Yale. Paris, 1785; Paris, 1789. In Yale.

The Life and Death of Common-Sense. A prelude. Altered from Fielding's Pasquinade, for a benefit, August 13, 1782, at the Hay-Market.

Never published. See Oulton, *History of the Theatres of London*, London, 1796, vol. I, p. 110; also Barker, *Drama Recorded*, London, 1814, p. 100.

### 1785

THE | Life, Death, and Renovation | OF | TOM THUMB; | A | LEGENDARY BURLETTA, | In One Act, | As it is PERFORMED at the | ROYAL CIRCUS. | — | Printed in the Year MDCCLXXXV.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

2 p. l. (Title, Characters, 2 songs); [3]-24 pp. 8 x 5. In Yale.

Author unknown. Listed in Barker, *Drama Recorded*, London, 1814, p. 100.

1787

TOM JONES | ET FELLAMAR, | SUITE | DE TOM JONES  
A LONDRES: | COMÉDIE | EN CINQ ACTES ET EN VERS. |  
PAR M. DESFORGES. | Réprésentée, pour la première fois, par  
les Comédiens | Italiens ordinaires du Roi, le Mardi 17 Avril 1787. |  
= | PRIX trente sols. | = | [Cut] | A PARIS, | CHEZ PRAULT,  
IMPRIMEUR DU ROI, | Quai des Augustins, à l' Immortalité. | — |  
1788.

2 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Personnages); 102 pp.; [2] pp. (Advertisement).  
8 $\frac{3}{8}$  x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ . In Yale.

Tom Jones Comédie.

A manuscript, beautifully written, on 46 leaves, without any date or name.  
In French. Act I, 7 scenes; Act II, 10 scenes; Act III, 10 scenes; Act IV,  
8 scenes; Act V, 6 scenes. ca. 1780-90. 12 $\frac{5}{8}$  x 8 $\frac{1}{8}$ . In Yale.

Ca. 1790

Um sechs Uhr ist Verlobung. Ein Lustspiel von fünf Aufzügen,  
nach dem Engl. des Fielding. Von F. L. Schröder.

Listed by Karl Goedeke, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der Deutschen Dichtung*,  
Dresden, 1887, p. 247. Published in *Deutsche Schaubühne*, Bd. XXII, Augs-  
burg, 1788, *et seq.*; also in Schröder's *Dram. Werke*, Bd. IV, Berlin, 1831.  
This play, which is not in the Yale Library, may have been the actor's adapta-  
tion of *The Wedding Day* to the German stage.

1794

THE RIVAL QUEENS, an occasional Prelude. By Thomas Hol-  
croft. Taken from Fielding's *Covent-Garden Tragedy*. Acted at  
Covent-Garden Theatre, Sept. 15, 1794.

Never published. Listed in Barker, *Drama Recorded*, London, 1814, p. 153.  
Condemned in Oulton, *History of the Theatres of London*, London, 1796, vol.  
II, p. 173.

1800

LE PORTRAIT | DE | FIELDING, | Comédie en un Acte, mêlée  
de Vaudevilles, | Par les citoyens SÉGUR, jeune, DESFAUCHERETS | et  
DESPRÉS. | REPRÉSENTÉE pour la première fois, sur | le théâtre  
du Vaudeville, rue de Malthe, | le 3 Floréal, an VIII. | [Cut] |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

A PARIS, | AU SALON LITTÉRAIRE, | Palais-Egalité, Galerie de pierres, côté de la rue de la | Loi, même maison que le Café Lycée des Arts, N<sup>o</sup>. 18. | = | De l'Imprimerie du Salon Littéraire.

1 p. l. (Title, Personnages); [3]-40 pp. 7 $\frac{5}{8}$  x 4 $\frac{7}{8}$ . First performed April 23, 1800. In Yale.

1823

FIELDING, | COMÉDIE | EN UN ACTE ET EN VERS. | Par M. ED. MENNECHET, | LECTEUR DU ROI. | Représentée, pour la première fois, sur le Théâtre-Français, par les | Comédiens ordinaires du Roi, le 8 janvier 1823. | [Cut] | A PARIS, | CHEZ LADVOCAT, LIBRAIRE, | PALAIS-ROYAL, GALERIE DE BOIS, N<sup>o</sup> 195. | — | MDCCCXXIII.

3 p. l. (Half-title, Title, Avertissement, Personnages); [7]-54 pp. In Yale.

1830

TOM THUMB, | A NEW OPERA, | TO BE PERFORMED AT THE | Theatre of Polities, | COUNTY COURT-HOUSE, | LIMERICK | — | January 1830.

1 p. l. (Title); [3]-12 pp. 6 $\frac{5}{8}$  x 4. In Yale.

1837

LAW OF THE LAND: | OR, | London in the Last Century.

“An entire new drama,” first performed at the Royal Surrey Theatre, London, Aug. 21, 1837, and published the same day. Based upon the career of William Dodd the forger, who appears under the name of Abel Dodsworth. One of the characters is “Henry Fielding, (*the celebrated Novelist*)” whose rôle, apparently as the Bow Street magistrate, was taken by “Mr. E. F. Saville.” Reviewed in the *Athenaeum*, Aug. 26, 1737, pp. 629-630. Original playbill in Yale.

1850

THE | IRISH DOCTOR; | OR, THE | DUMB LADY CURED. | A farce | IN ONE ACT. | Altered from FIELDING'S Translation of MOLIERE'S “Le Medicin | Malgre Lui,” | BY | GEORGE WOOD, COMEDIAN, | THOMAS HAILES LACY, | WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND, | LONDON.

1 p. l. (Title, Characters); [3]-22 pp. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$  x 4. In vol. XXVII of Lacy's Acting Edition of Plays. In Yale.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1886

Sophia, a Play founded on *Tom Jones*, written by Robert Buchanan, and produced at the Vaudeville theatre, London, April 12, 1886, under the management of Thomas Thorne.

Apparently published. Cyril Maude made his first success as Fellamar; Fred Thorne was Squire Western; Thomas Thorne, Partridge; Charles Glenney, Tom Jones; Kate Rorke, Sophia; Helen Forsyth, Molly Seagrim. The cast is given in *The Graphic*, April 17, 1886. Buchanan "dropped a veil" over Tom's misdeeds. For his "distortions" of the novel he was ridiculed in *The Saturday Review*, April 17.

1888

Joseph's Sweetheart, a play in five Acts founded on *Joseph Andrews*, written by Robert Buchanan, and produced at the Vaudeville theatre, London, in March, 1888.

Never published. Cast is given in *The Graphic*, March 17, 1888. Mrs. Cyril Maude was Fanny; Mrs. Eliza Johnstone, Mrs. Slipslop; H. B. Conway, Joseph Andrews; and Thomas Thorne, Parson Adams.

1907

Tom Jones, a Comic Opera in Three Acts, by Robert Courtneidge and Alexander M. Thompson. Music by Edward German. Lyrics by Charles H. Taylor. Produced at the Apollo Theatre, London, on the bicentenary of Fielding's birth, April, 1907.

Never published; but cast, illustrations, specimens of the music, are given in *The Play Pictorial*, no. 58, vol. X, June, 1907. See also a drawing of the characters by H. M. Brock, and an account of the performance in *The Graphic*, April 27, 1907, pp. 616, 618. Original drawing in Yale.

## V

### LETTERS AND MANUSCRIPTS

In this list are given not only the existing manuscripts so far as they are known, but also other manuscripts which, though they may not now exist, have been mentioned in former times. Certain legal documents, however, which have Fielding's signature have been omitted. Unless otherwise stated, the manuscripts are autographs.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1730

Letter "To the Right Honorable the Lady Mary Wortley Montagu," dated "7br 4," concerning *The Modern Husband* while the play was yet in manuscript. The date is probably September 4, 1730; see this biography, vol. I, pp. 95, 118-119.

The manuscript of the concluding part of the letter is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington. There is a clever forgery of most of the letter (presented by Mr. C. B. Greenough, who supposed it genuine) in the Library of the Boston Athenæum, apparently made from a facsimile of the original letter (except the lost beginning) in the *Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (illustrated edition), 1803, vol. I, p. 106. First published in *Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 1803, vol. I, p. 89. Also *Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 1837, vol. I, pp. lvi-lvii; 1861, vol. II, pp. 19-20; Lawrence, *Henry Fielding*, 1855, p. 43; Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 40-41.

1732

Letter to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, with which Fielding sent her a copy of a play, supposed to be *The Modern Husband*. Without date. If the play was this, then the date must have been February or March, 1732, as the comedy was published on Feb. 21, 1732.

Original unknown. First published in *Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (illustrated edition), 1803, vol. I, pp. 88. Also *Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 1837, vol. I, pp. lvi; 1861, vol. II, p. 19; Lawrence, *Henry Fielding*, 1855, p. 43; and Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 314.

Receipt dated April 4, 1732 from "Henry Ffielding" to John Watts, for twenty guineas, for the copyright of the *Despairing Debauchee* [sic] and the *Covent-Garden Tragedy*, which Fielding promises "to assign over to the sd John Watts."

Single sheet, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ . In the Adam Collection, Buffalo, N. Y. Reproduced here in facsimile, facing p. 360.

1737

Indenture dated February 3, 1737, signed by Henry, Catherine, Ursula, Sarah, Beatrice, and Edmund Fielding, and William Day, releasing Davidge Gould and William Day from their trust in the estate at East Stour.

Three folding folio pages on vellum.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Indenture dated February 3, 1737, signed by Henry, Catherine, Ursula, Sarah, Beatrice, and Edmund Fielding, and William Day, conveying the estate in the parish of East Stour, County Dorset, to Robert Stillingfleet, of New Sarum, in Wiltshire.

Two folding folio pages on vellum.

This and the preceding indenture, with a letter from Henry Fielding to Davidge Gould, dated July 15, 1740, his reply, and a letter and document signed by John Fielding, were sold at Sotheby's on Feb. 19, 1913, for £300, and later the same year were offered for sale by B. F. Stevens and Brown, for £600. Sold at Sotheby's, July 20, 1916. Again offered for sale, by J. Pearson and Co., June 1918, for £600. Copies of the originals in Yale.

1738

Deed, Trinity Term 1738, whereby "Henry Fielding and Charlotte his wife" convey property at East Stour to Thomas Hayter for the sum of £260 (London Public Record Office, Feet of Fines, Dorset, Trinity, 11-12 Geo. II; also Godden, *Henry Fielding*, pp. 93-94; and this biography, vol. I, p. 240). Original deed with the Fielding signatures unknown.

1739

Letter, dated July 9, 1739, to John Nourse, asking him to look for a house.

Original formerly in the collection of Alfred Huth. First published by Godden in *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 94-95. See this biography, vol. I, pp. 248-249.

1740

Receipt, dated March 10, 1739 (new style 1740), given by Fielding to John Nourse for forty-five pounds in part payment for a translation of the *History of Charles the Twelfth*.

Offered for sale May 4, 1908, by James Tregaskis for 25 guineas; offered 1913, by B. F. Stevens and Brown, for £105, and in 1914, by Pearson & Co., for £105. Sold at Sotheby's July 20, 1916. See this biography, vol. I, pp. 284-287.

Letter to Davidge Gould, dated "Basingstoke, 15 July, 1740," asking him to send documents to Dorchester Assizes.

Sold at Sotheby's, Dec. 8, 1911; and again July 20, 1916. Published in this biography, vol. I, p. 258.

sets or by other tools of the same  
class shall be called one:

222 April 4, 1932

Autograph Receipt for Twenty Pounds Payment for the Delivering Johnson and the Everett Garden. Tugely from the John Collection. *Appleton*, 174.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1741

Letter to John Nourse, dated April 20, 1741, requesting that he deliver to another bookseller, copies of *True Greatness* and *The Vernon-iad*.

One page quarto. Original formerly in the collection of W. Upcott; now in the collection of W. K. Bixby, St. Louis, Mo. First published by Roscoe in facsimile, in *Works of Henry Fielding*, 1840, following p. xxviii; also Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 115; and this biography, vol. I, p. 288.

1742

Assignment of *Joseph Andrews*, *Miss Lucy in Town*, and *Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough*, to Andrew Millar, dated April 18, 1742.

Original in the South Kensington Museum. Sold, in 1851, by Sotheby for 10 s. (*Athenaeum*, July 26, 1851, p. 806). Facsimile reproduction in Fielding's *Works*, London, 1893, vol. II, preceding p. 1; New York, 1903, vol. I, p. 16. Partly reproduced in facsimile in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 130.

1748

Receipt dated June 11, 1748, from "Hen: Ffielding" to Andrew Millar, for £600, "for the sole Copy Right of a Book called the History of a Foundling in Eighteen Books."

A piece of foolscap,  $3\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ . Original with Assignment of 1749, sold by Sotheby in 1851, for £1. Formerly in the collection of Alfred Huth; now in the library of J. P. Morgan, New York.

Letter to the Duke of Bedford, dated "Bow Street. Decr. 13, 1748."

Original at Woburn Abbey. First published in *Correspondence of John Fourth Duke of Bedford*, 1842, vol. I, pp. 589-590. Also in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 196-197; and in this biography, vol. II, pp. 96-97.

1748-1751

Robert Ainsworth, *A Compendious Dictionary of the Latin Tongue, With Additions by Samuel Patrick*, London, 1746. 4 to. In Sale Catalogue of Samuel Baker, 1755, no. 419. "With MSS notes by Mr Fielding." Brought 16 s.

The notes were probably made in 1748-1751. See this biography, vol. III, pp. 80-82.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

1749

Assignment of "The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling," by "H Ffielding" to Andrew Millar, dated March 25, 1749.

Folio 123 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ . Formerly in the collection of Alfred Huth; now in the library of J. P. Morgan. Published with the receipt in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 304-305; and in this biography, vol. II, pp. 108 and 118-119. Only the signature is in Fielding's hand.

Letter to the Duke of Bedford, dated "Bow Street, July 3. 1749," asking for the appointment as Solicitor to the Excise.

Original at Woburn Abbey. First published in *Correspondence of John Fourth Duke of Bedford*, 1842, vol. II, pp. 35-36. Also Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 209; and in this biography, vol. II, p. 242.

Draught of a Bill for the better preventing Street-Robberies, sent to Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, July 21, 1749.

Text unknown. The draught was probably the basis of the law as enacted March 26, 1752 (*Statutes at Large*, 25 Geo. II, 36). See this biography, vol. II, p. 280.

Letter to Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, sending draught of the above Bill and copy of the *Charge to the Grand Jury*, dated July 21, 1749.

Original in Brit. Mus., Additional Manuscripts, 35590, f. 334. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 209-210; also in this biography, vol. II, pp. 243-244.

Letter to the Honourable George Lyttelton Esq., dated "Bow Street, Aug 29, 1749."

Original in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; reproduced here, vol. II, facing p. 246. First published in Sir Robert Phillimore's *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lyttelton*, 1845, vol. I, pp. 336-338. Also in Lawrence, *Henry Fielding*, 1855, pp. 277-278; Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 211-213; and this biography, vol. II, pp. 245-248.

1750

Letter to the Duke of Bedford, dated "Bow Street. May 14, 1750," promising to preserve the peace.

Original at Woburn Abbey. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 221; also in this biography, vol. II, p. 248.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Letter to Hutton Perkins, of Lincoln's Inn, dated "Bow Street. Nov. 25, 1750," making an appointment.

Original in Brit. Mus., Additional Manuscripts, 35591, f. 147. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 222; also in this biography, vol. II, p. 249.

### 1751

Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, dated "Bow Street Jan. 15. 1750" (new style 1751).

Original in Brit. Mus., Additional Manuscripts, 32685, f. 59. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 231; also in this biography, vol. II, p. 253.

### 1752-1753

M. Beni. Hederici, *Lexicon Manuale Gracum*. London. 1732. 4 to. In Sale Catalogue, 1755, no. 258. "Cum notis MSS Henr. Fielding." Brought £1 1 s.

The notes were probably made in 1752-1753; see this biography, vol. III, pp. 80-82.

### 1753

Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, dated "Ealing April 14, 1753."

Original in the London Public Record Office, State Papers, Domestic, Geo. II, 127, no. 24. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 273-274; also in this biography, vol. II, pp. 290-291.

Letter to the Duke of Newcastle dated "Ealing April 27, 1753."

Original in the London Public Record Office (reference as in the preceding item). First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 274-275; also in this biography, vol. II, pp. 291-292.

Memorial of Henry Fielding, Esq; one of his Majesties Justices of the Peace for the County of Mdse [Middlesex] and for the City and Liberty of Westm: This is the rough draught of the opening of a memorial addressed to one of the Secretaries of State on behalf of seven men employed as special constables, who had been deprived of the rewards due them, and were looked down on as thief-takers.

2 pp. folio, torn and defective. Undated, but written in the autumn of 1753. Sold at Sotheby's March 12, 1912, and again Feb. 25, 1918. See this biography, vol. III, p. 8.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Letter to Lord High Chancellor Hardwicke dated, "Decr 6, 1753," recommending the appointment of Saunders Welch as a justice of the peace for Middlesex.

Original in Brit. Mus., Additional Manuscripts, 35604, f. 127. First published in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, p. 279; also in this biography, vol. III, p. 13.

1754

Will of Henry Fielding, undated but written and signed in May or June, 1754; proved Nov. 14, 1754.

Discovered by G. A. Aitken in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and first published in the *Athenaeum*, Feb. 1, 1890, vol. I, p. 149. Additional information in Godden, *Henry Fielding*, 1910, pp. 308-309. Also this biography, vol. III, pp. 22-23. It is not stated whether the will is entirely in Fielding's own hand.

Letter to "John Fielding Esq. at his House in Bow Street Covt Garden London." Dated "On board the Queen of Portugal, Richd Veal at anchor on the Mother Bank, off Ryde, to the Care of the Post Master of Portsmouth—this is my Date and yr Direction. July 12, 1754."

Original formerly in the collection of Frederick Locker-Lampson. First published in J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of Celebrated Etonians*, 1875, vol. I, pp. 83-86. Many times reprinted; see this biography, vol. III, pp. 32-33.

Letter to John Fielding, dated "Torr Bay, July 22, 1754."

The original, formerly in the possession of the late George Fielding, was sold at Sotheby's March 15, 1912, and again Feb. 25, 1918. First published by Dobson, in *The National Review*, Aug. 1911, pp. 985-986. See this biography, vol. III, pp. 41-43.

Letter to John Fielding, from Lisbon.

3½ pp. folio, badly torn and defective; apparently a whole sheet is missing. Undated, but written during the first week of Sept. 1754. The original, formerly in the possession of the late George Fielding, was sold at Sotheby's with the preceding letter. First published, in part, by Dobson in *The National Review*, Aug. 1911, pp. 988-992. Published, with additional passages in this biography, vol. III, pp. 52-58.

Letter from Lisbon. Undated, but written in Sept. 1754.

This letter, presumably to John Fielding, is described as short and of little importance. See J. Paul de Castro in *Notes and Queries*, Sept. 12, 1914, ser. 11, vol. X, p. 214.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### LEGAL MANUSCRIPTS OF UNCERTAIN DATE

A List of "Offences ag<sup>t</sup> the King & his State immedly w<sup>ch</sup> the Law terms High Treason, Offences ag<sup>t</sup> him in a gen<sup>l</sup> Light as touching the Commonwealth at large, as Trade &C, Offences ag<sup>t</sup> him as Supreme Magistrate," etc.

2½ pages. 7 $\frac{5}{16}$  x 3 $\frac{3}{16}$ . Undated but probably written ca 1740. Formerly in the Morrison Collection. Described in the Catalogue of the Morrison Manuscripts, vol. II, London, 1883. Now in the Adam Collection, Buffalo, N. Y.

William Hawkins, *A Treatise on the Pleas of the Crown*. London, 1726. 2 vols. folio. No. 102 in Sale Catalogue, 1755. "With a great number of MSS Notes by Mr Fielding." Brought £1 2 s.

These notes were taken with a view to a treatise on Crown Law, probably in the years following 1740.

William Hawkins, *An Abridgment of the Pleas of the Crown*. London, 1728. 4 vols. "Interleaved with MSS Notes by Mr Fielding." No. 509 in Sale Catalogue, 1755. Brought 11 s.

See preceding entry.

#### Extracts made by Henry Fielding from *The Country Justice*.

Single sheet, folio. Undated, but ca. 1750. Certified as Henry Fielding's writing by his grandson, W. H. Fielding. MS. sold at Sotheby's Feb. 25, 1918. Fielding had in his library two copies of Michael Dalton's *Country Justice*, 1705 and 1715 (Sale Catalogue, 1755, nos. 157 and 107).

Thomas Wood, *Institute of the Laws of England*. London. 3 vols. folio. "Interleaved with MSS. Notes by Mr Fielding. No. 276 in Sale Catalogue, 1755. Brought 5 s."

Legal Notes concerning the proper procedure in obtaining and dealing with the declaration or confession of a prisoner. References on the margin to various statutes and to Hawkins's *Pleas of the Crown*. At the end is written in a fine hand: "I certify the above to have been written by Henry Fielding, the Author of Tom Jones &c &c William Henry Fielding Grandson of the above Chelsea Nov<sup>r</sup> 1827" Undated. Ca. 1750, while Fielding was a justice of the peace.

Single sheet, 11 $\frac{1}{2}$  x 6 $\frac{5}{8}$ . In the Adam Collection, Buffalo, N. Y.

## THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Legal Notes similar to the preceding. Attested by W. H. Fielding.

Single sheet, written on both sides. 11 $\frac{1}{4}$  x 6 $\frac{7}{8}$ . In the Adam Collection, Buffalo, N. Y.

A note by "Peter Burke, Serjeant at Law, 3 Serjeants' Inn, W.C.", dated "30 March 1867," says that he received the manuscript from his uncle "Joseph Burke Esq.", to whom it had been given by W. H. Fielding, "a very eccentric character." This W. H. Fielding is further described as a natural son of William Fielding, the police magistrate, by a "handsome" woman whom he afterwards married.

These and the preceding Legal Notes are certainly in Henry Fielding's hand. The sheets upon which they are written were torn from the same book or from two books of similar size. Perhaps they once formed a part of the manuscripts described immediately below. At any rate, it is clear that William Henry Fielding had one or more manuscript books of his grandfather, from which he tore out leaves to be sold or given away.

Law Manuscripts by Mr. Fielding. 5 vols. folio. No. 653 in Sale Catalogue, 1755. Brought 13 s.

Murphy, in *Works of Henry Fielding*, 1762, vol. I, p. 29, states that Henry Fielding left two volumes in folio on crown law, and that "this work still remains unpublished in the hands of his brother Sir John Fielding; and by him I am informed that it is deemed perfect in some parts." Roscoe in *Works of Henry Fielding*, 1840, p. xi, calls it "a voluminous Digest of the Statutes at Large, in two folio Volumes." Lawrence in *Henry Fielding*, 1855, p. 143, quotes Murphy. It would appear that these volumes were in addition to the five vols. noted in No. 653 of the Sale Catalogue, 1755, being retained by John Fielding. They may have been destroyed in the riots of 1780.

On Fielding's law manuscripts, of which Sir John Fielding published "*A Treatise on the Office of Constable*," see this biography, vol. III, pp. 80, 83.

## INDEX



## INDEX

*Act for Preventing Thefts and Robberies*, Fielding's probable authorship of, ii, 280, iii, 339, 362.

ADAM, R. B., his Fielding MSS., iii, 359, 365-6.

ADAMS, Parson Abraham, see *Joseph Andrews*; also Young, William.

ADDISON, Joseph, read by Fielding, i, 47; in Fielding's *Journey*, i, 400; his style, i, 276, ii, 49, iii, 61, 241; at Percy Lodge, ii, 116; Shakespeare's *Cliff*, iii, 31; *Cato*, i, 206-7; *Freeholder*, ii, 92; *Tatler*, i, 90; mentioned, ii, 109.

ADLERFIELD, Gustave, *History of Charles XII*, i, 285-7; iii, 337-8.

*Adventurer, The*, ii, 424; bibliography, iii, 347.

*Adventures of David Simple*, see Fielding, Sarah.

AIKIN, Dr. John, estimate of Fielding, iii, 196, 199-200.

AINSWORTH, Robert, i, 346, iii, 80-1, 339, 361.

AITKEN, G. A., iii, 23 n, 364.

*Alchymist, The*, i, 238, 249.

ALCOCK, Rev. Thomas, ii, 279.

ALDERFIELD, see Adlerfeld.

ALLEN, Capt., iii, 57.

ALLEN, Ralph, i, 376-7; first wife, ii, 218; friendship with Richard Graves, ii, 110, iii, 112, with Fielding, ii, 115, iii, 134, 266; anecdote of Carew, ii, 150; has Warburton as guest, ii, 127; subscribes for *Miscellanies*, i, 382-3; aids Fielding, i, 377, ii, 100, 115, 333, iii, 218-9, 272; original of Mr. Allworthy, ii, 127, 162-

4, 196, 209, iii, 283, of Dr. Harrison, ii, 331, 333; referred to in *Joseph Andrews*, i, 377; *Amelia* dedicated to, ii, 304, 312-3, 353, iii, 4; Fielding appoints him executor, iii, 22-3, 75, 116; benefactions to Fielding's children, iii, 117; friendship with Sarah Fielding, iii, 112-3; subscribes for her *Familiar Letters*, ii, 47; Fielding's works dedicated to, iii, 328; not quoted by Murphy, iii, 185; portrait of Fielding owned by, iii, 73.

*Amelia*, ii, 303-56; date of writing, ii, 311-2, iii, 81, 274; publication, ii, 304-11, 357; dedicated to Ralph Allen, ii, 304, 312-3, 353, iii, 4; reviewed and attacked, ii, 336-46, 387; Fielding replies, ii, 340-5; approval by other critics, ii, 346, 348, iii, 167; described, ii, 312-27; was it self-revelation? ii, 328; fact and fiction in the novel, ii, 329-35, iii, 147; identification of characters, i, 164, 169, 174, ii, 3, 5, 330; the noseless heroine, ii, 338-41, 346, 348, 352; the book revised, ii, 351-6, iii, 9, and republished, ii, 356, iii, 127; no copy in Fielding's library, iii, 79; relation to *The Modern Husband*, i, 121, ii, 325, iii, 278, to *The Temple Beau*, ii, 325, to Kenrick's *The Duellist*, iii, 154, 354, and to Dickens's *Oliver Twist*, iii, 229; altered by Madame Riccoboni, iii, 184; parodied as *Shamelia*, ii, 335; its morality, ii, 349, iii, 167, 200-2; literary estimate by Mrs. Barbauld, iii, 199-202, by Coleridge, iii, 176, by John Oliver Hobbes, iii, 175-6, by Dr. Johnson, ii, 338, iii, 158, by Mudford,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

iii, 202-3, by Murphy, iii, 132-4, 147, 204, by Richardson, ii, 349-51, by Scott, ii, 323, iii, 166, 211, by Stephen, iii, 243, by Taine, iii, 188, by Thackeray, iii, 215, 222; read by Dorothy Wordsworth, iii, 172-3; quoted by F. S. Dickson, iii, 220; mentioned, ii, 357, iii, 96, 166, 285; bibliography, iii, 178-9, 321-2, 329, 332.

AMHURST, Nicholas, i, 103-4.

ANDERSON, Dr. Robert, iii, 164.

ANDREW, Sarah, i, 50-5, 165, 385, ii, 170, iii, 268-9.

*Annual Register*, ii, 2.

ANSON, Lord, iii, 30, 61, 91.

*Apology for the Conduct of . . . a Second-rate Minister*, ii, 72-3, 75, iii, 344-5.

*Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews*, see *Shamela*.

*Apology for the Life of Mr. T. C.*, see *Cibber*, T.

ARBUTHNOT, Dr. John, iii, 350.

ARGYLE, Duke of, i, 144, 250, 270, 289, 290, 382, iii, 266.

ARISTOPHANES, read at Eton, i, 44-5; authority for political satire in drama, i, 225; Fielding's mature view of, i, 46, ii, 433; his projected translation, i, 362-5; see also *Plutus*.

ARNE, Thomas Augustine, at Eton with Fielding, i, 42; wrote music for *Tom Thumb*, i, 42, 146, 147, iii, 351, for *The Fall of Phaeton*, i, 192, for *Squire Badger* and *The Sot*, iii, 154, 354; brother of Mrs. Cibber, i, 211.

ARNOLD, Matthew, on literary glory, iii, 195.

ASH, Isabella, iii, 23-4, 35, 54, 57-9.

ASKEW, Dr. Anthony, iii, 82.

ASTLEY, Thomas, ii, 129.

AUSTEN, Jane, iii, 172, 188, 228.

*Author's Farce*, described, i, 80-5, 102-3, 394, iii, 141; performed, i, 86, 95, 102, iii, 271; revised, i, 149-54,

iii, 144; Fielding as Luckless in, iii, 135; Wilks and Cibber in, i, 115, 150, 307; Mrs. Haywood in, i, 147; poem in appreciation of, i, 161; not read by Thackeray, iii, 214; mentioned, i, 79, 177, 180; bibliography, iii, 290-1, 311, 320, 328.

BADDELEY, Robert, iii, 105.

BAKER, David E., i, 209.

BAKER, Henry, iii, 336.

BAKER, Sir Richard, i, 47, ii, 80.

BAKER, Samuel, iii, 76, 80.

BAKER, Thomas H., i, 164 n.

BALGUY, Rev. Thomas, ii, 310.

BANIER, Abbé, *Mythology*, ii, 106-8, iii, 336.

BANKS, John, i, 86, 100.

BARBAULD, Mrs. A. L., edited Richardson's *Correspondence*, iii, 195-6, and *The British Novelists*, iii, 199; *Life: a Poem*, iii, 199; estimate of Fielding, iii, 199-202.

BARBER, Frances, i, 35.

BARKER, George, iii, 73.

BARKER, Dr. John, i, 382.

BARNARD, Sir John, i, 225, 229.

BARRINGTON, Lord, iii, 116.

BARRY, Spranger, ii, 413, 423.

BARTHE, Nicolas T., iii, 187.

BASING, Lord, i, 71.

BASIRE, James, engraved portrait of Fielding, iii, 72-4, 328.

BATH, Earl of, see Pulteney, William.

BATHURST, Earl of, ii, 227-8.

*Battle of the Poets*, see Cooke.

BAXTER, Dudley, ii, 242.

BEARD, John, i, 369, 385.

BEATTIE, James, iii, 151, 167.

BECK, Timothy, ii, 266-7.

BEDFORD, Duchess of, ii, 47.

BEDFORD, Duke of, supports Chesterfield in the Lords, i, 179; subscribes for *Miscellanies*, i, 382; Field-

# INDEX

ing's patron, ii, 95-8, 111-2, 126, 242-3, iii, 18, 211; as Allworthy, ii, 162; Fielding's letters to, ii, 248, iii, 361-2; mentioned, i, 363, ii, 238, iii, 266.

BELLAMY, Mrs. George Anne, ii, 423.

BELLEGARDE, J. B. M. de, *Réflexions sur le Ridicule*, i, 333, ii, 436.

BENNET, Anne, iii, 113.

BENNET, Mother, i, 111.

BENSLEY, Robert, iii, 105, 107, 354.

BENSON, Bishop Martin, ii, 346.

BENTHAM, Mary, i, 21, 39.

BENTLEY, Dr. R., i, 99-100, 292.

BERE, Abbot, i, 17.

BERKELEY, Bishop, ii, 12, iii, 16-7.

BERTHON, Mrs., iii, 59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, iii, 287-366.

BIDDLECOMBE, Thomas, ii, 167.

BINGHAM, Charles W., iii, 334.

BIRCH, Dr. Thomas, iii, 84.

BIXBY, William K., iii, 361.

*Blackwood's Magazine*, on Fielding, iii, 228-9; William Mudford a contributor to, iii, 201.

BLAIR, Hugh, estimate of Fielding, iii, 169.

BLAND, Henry, headmaster at Eton, i, 43-7, 48.

BLAND, John, ii, 253.

BLANKENBURG, C. F., iii, 191, 193.

*Blast upon Blast*, i, 367, iii, 342.

BODE, J. J., iii, 190.

BODENS, Charles, *Modish Couple*, i, 118, iii, 294.

BOERHAAVE, Hermann, iii, 2, 16.

BOLINGBROKE, Lord, leader of Opposition, i, 103, 249; contributor to the *Craftsman*, i, 104; Fielding's *Comment on Lord Bolingbroke's Essays*, iii, 17-20, 25, 84, 93, 200, 326, 329; mentioned, ii, 20, 116, 166.

BOOR, Richard, iii, 23-4, 41-2, 58.

BOOTH, Barton, at Theatre Royal, i, 61, 142, 147; thinks *Don Quixote* in England immature, i, 74; Johnson's *Caelia*, i, 143; illness and death, i, 147-8; Fielding's friendship with, iii, 266.

BOOTH, Mrs., i, 63, 148, 156.

BOOTLE, Thomas, ii, 6.

BORROW, George, iii, 70.

BOSWELL, James, iii, 161-3.

BOWDIDGE, John, i, 51.

BOYCE, David, iii, 36-8.

BOYSE, Samuel, ii, 103.

BRACEGIRDLE, Mrs., iii, 219.

BRADDOCK, Fanny, i, 129.

BRADSHAIGH, Lady, ii, 143-4, 148-9, 350.

BREWSTER, Dr. Thomas, of Bath, i, 377, 382, ii, 174.

*British Magazine*, ii, 390.

BROCK, H. M., iii, 358.

BROGDEN, Joshua, ii, 119-20, 224 n, 226, 244, 369-71, 428.

BRONTË, Charlotte, iii, 231-2.

BROOKFIELD, Mrs., iii, 214-5, 217-8.

BROWN, Mountefort, ii, 419-20, 422.

BROWN, William H., iii, 175.

BROWNE, Isaac Hawkins, i, 245.

BROWNE, James P., iii, 129, 239, 332.

BRUNTON, Mary, iii, 207.

BRYDGES, Sir Egerton, iii, 122.

BUCHANAN, Robert, iii, 358.

BUCKINGHAM, 1st Duke of, i, 6, 9, 19, 83, 371, ii, 358.

BUCKLE, Thomas, i, 376.

BULLOCK, William, i, 76.

BULWER, *see* Lytton.

BURKE, Edmund, ii, 418, iii, 165.

BURMANN, Peter, i, 67-8, 99-100.

BURNET, Bishop, ii, 354, iii, 61.

BURNEY, Dr. Charles, iii, 161.

BURNEY, Frances, ii, 310, iii, 155, 158, 160, 172.

BURNS, Robert, iii, 70.

BUTE, Countess of, ii, 128, 328, 333, iii, 345.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

BUTLER, Samuel, iii, 253, 275.  
BYRON, Lord, ii, 209, iii, 204, 231.

CADELL, Alderman, ii, 305-6.  
CADIERE, Catherine, i, 126.  
*Caelia*, *see* Johnson, Charles.  
CAILLOT, Joseph, iii, 182.  
*Calm address to all Parties*, iii, 310.  
CAMDEN, Lord, i, 42, 244-5, 259, ii, 2, 110, iii, 266.  
CAMPBELL, Thomas, iii, 170.  
*Candidates for the Bays*, i, 113 n, iii, 341.  
CANNING, Elizabeth, ii, 190, 285-300, 389, iii, 6, 128-9, 325, 332.  
CANNING, George, iii, 173.  
CAREW, Bampfylde Moore, ii, 150-2.  
CAREY, Henry, i, 198.  
CARTE, Thomas, ii, 87-8.  
CARTER, Mrs. Elizabeth, ii, 346-7.  
CARTERET, John, i, 250, 270, 289, 299.  
*Case of Elizabeth Canning*, *see* Canning.

CASTLE, Edmund, ii, 366.  
CASTRO, J. Paul de, his investigations and their results, iii, 249; Cradock family, 1, 164 n; Hogarth ticket to *Pasquin*, i, 197 n; authorship of *Shamela*, i, 305 n; information about William Young, i, 347 n, 364 n; Miss Husband, i, 379 n; Strahan's ledger-entries, i, 355 n, ii, 305 n, iii, 86 n; Fielding's residence in Boswell Court, ii, 11-2, 109 n, iii, 149, 272 n; his residence at Bow Street, ii, 112 n, iii, 272 n; his farm at Ealing, ii, 290 n; Walton-Collier suit, ii, 42-4; anecdote of Lord Justice Page, ii, 3 n; Fielding's letters to his brother from Lisbon, iii, 52 n, 64 n, 364; identification of Mr. Williamson, iii, 59 n; letter on Fielding at Ryde, iii, 95 n; the papers *On Jonathan Wild* not by Fielding, iii,

340; *also* i, 17 n, 33 n, 40 n, ii, 167 n, 254 n, iii, 70 n.

*Cat and the Fiddle*, ii, 330.  
*Causidicade, The*, ii, 4, 9, 10, 63, 86, iii, 343.

CAVE, Edward, ii, 130-1.  
CAWTHORN, James, ii, 131-2.  
*CELIA*, *see* Fielding, Charlotte.  
*Censor, The*, *see* *Covent-Garden Journal*.

CENTLIVRE, Mrs. Susannah, i, 131.  
*Certain Consequences of the Rebellion*, iii, 310.

CERVANTES, Fielding reads, i, 70; influence upon Fielding, ii, 400; theory of humour, i, 332-3; Fielding imitates him, i, 321-2; *Don Quixote* and *Joseph Andrews*, i, 323, 342, 394, ii, 194, 205; compared with Fielding, ii, 372, iii, 97, 194; Fielding's estimate of, i, 46, ii, 414, 433, 436, iii, 19; works in Fielding's library, iii, 79.

CHALMERS, Alexander; says Fielding studied under Vitriarius, i, 66; revises Murphy's edition of Fielding's works, iii, 128-9, 203-4, 330.

*Champion, The*, partnership formed to publish, i, 250; the editors and shareholders, i, 285-6, 288, ii, 18, 358, 385, iii, 1; first number appears, i, 251; Fielding as editor of, i, 362, 409, iii, 274; his contributions to it, i, 139, 245, 252-7, 259-61, 263, 265-6, 276-82, 287, 324, 384-5, 394, 410, 412, 422, ii, 233, 238, 365, 390, 413, 434, iii, 1, 127-9, 131, 279; tribute to Lillo in, i, 200; Fielding parodies Croke in, i, 249; print of *The Golden Rump* in, i, 228, 266; attacks Walpole, i, 260-71, 366, 408, ii, 13, iii, 63, 280, Cibber, i, 271-6; Fielding loses interest in, and resigns, i, 257, 260, 301, 350, ii, 364; Ralph succeeds him, i, 260; men-

# INDEX

tioned, i, 315, 363, 375; bibliography, iii, 302, 304-5, 333, 338, 342.

CHANCELLOR, Matthew, ii, 360.

CHAPPELLE, Henry, i, 250, 260, 295-6, ii, 18, iii, 304-5.

*Charge delivered to the Grand Jury*, ii, 230-4, 243, 254, iii, 99, 319, 329, 362.

CHARKE, Mrs. Charlotte, her engagement with Fielding profitable, i, 203-4, iii, 140; in *The Modern Husband*, i, 120; in *Pasquin*, i, 187-8, iii, 140; in *Tumble-Down Dick*, i, 194, 200, 203; in *A Rehearsal of Kings*, i, 208; in *The Historical Register*, i, 214; in Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, i, 202; in Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity*, i, 200, 202, 217.

CHARLES EDWARD STUART, his invasion of England, ii, 12-8, 33; his resemblance to Lyttelton, ii, 36-7; reads *Tom Jones*, ii, 36-7, 140.

CHAUCER, ii, 382-3, iii, 175, 270.

CHESTERFIELD, Lord, Anecdote of Heidegger, i, 59; *Don Quixote* dedicated to, i, 159, 179, iii, 298; has support of the Duke of Bedford, i, 179, and the Duchess of Marlborough, i, 362; goes to The Hague, ii, 13; contributes to *Fog's Weekly Journal*, i, 182-3, to *Old England*, ii, 13; with Lyttelton establishes *Common Sense*, i, 218-9; gave management of the newspaper to Molloy, i, 239; in a *Pasquin* print, i, 197; in *An Essay on Nothing*, i, 390; speech on the Licensing Act, i, 230-3; not a Jacobite, ii, 74; subscribes to the *Miscellanies*, i, 382; his theory of humour, i, 334; Bolingbroke's farewell to, iii, 18; Fielding's relations with, i, 179, 290, iii, 266; Fielding's estimate of, i, 144, 159-60, 179, 250, 289, 387, ii, 20, 51, 53, 138.

CHETWOOD, W. R., i, 97.

*Chrysipus*, i, 390-4, iii, 308.

CHUBB, Thomas, ii, 169-70.

CHUDLEIGH, Elizabeth, iii, 117-20.

CHURCHILL, General Charles, i, 362.

CIBBER, Colley, manager of Theatre-Royal, i, 61, 142, 147-8; refuses Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, i, 61; the Great Mogul, i, 178; completes and produces Vanbrugh's *Provok'd Husband*, i, 61-2, 89-90; produces *Love in Several Masques*, and has rôle in it, i, 61-3; in *The Author's Farce*, i, 82, 150; his estimate of *Don Quixote in England*, i, 74; produces Thomson's *New Sophonisba*, i, 83; ridiculed in *Mist's Weekly Journal*, i, 89; burlesqued by Fielding, i, 89-90, iii, 280-2; in *The Battle of the Poets*, i, 96; Fielding makes peace with, i, 115; has rôle in *The Modern Husband*, i, 120; enemy of Pope, i, 123, 366-7; ridiculed in *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 123; wants to change name of Johnson's *Caelia*, i, 143; writes Epilogue to *The Miser*, i, 144; as poet laureate, i, 115, 152, ii, 244; in *Pasquin*, i, 183; on Fielding and the Licensing Act, i, 205; in *The Historical Register*, i, 211-2; Fielding ridicules his *Papal Tyranny*, i, 212-3, ii, 432; attacked in *The Champion*, i, 256, 283; his *Apology* and Fielding's ridicule of it, i, 271-7, 290, 297, 299, 301, 316-7; Conny Keyber's *Shamela*, i, 303-13, 320, iii, 303-4; in preface to *Plutus*, i, 363, 366; in *The Apology for a Second-rate Minister*, ii, 72-3; mentioned, i, 99, 139, ii, 358, iii, 266-7, 337.

CIBBER, Theophilus, manager of Theatre-Royal, i, 115, 142, 148, 150, 177; rôle in *The Modern Husband*, i, 120-1; rôle in *The Old Debauchees* and *The Covent-Garden Tragedy*, i, 130-1; letter on the latter, i, 133,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

iii, 296; produces *The Miser* and *The Harlot's Progress*, i, 143; ridiculed in *The Author's Farce*, i, 152-3; negotiations with Fleetwood, i, 156-7; rivalry with Macklin, i, 157; rôle in *The Universal Gallant*, i, 171; the Great Mogul, i, 178; *Apology for the Life of Mr. T. C.*, i, 188, 282, iii, 337; in *Tumble-Down Dick*, i, 193; produces *Euridice*, i, 207; wants rôle of Polly Peachum for his wife, i, 211; contributes to *The Daily Gazetteer*, i, 266; in *The Champion*, i, 274, 283.

CIBBER, Mrs. Theophilus, i, 211, 385, ii, 50, 174, 413, 423.

CLarendon, Lord, ii, 196.

*Clarissa Harlowe*, see Richardson, Samuel.

*Clear State of the Case of Elizabeth Canning*, see Canning.

CLIVE, Mrs. Catherine, in *The Old Debauchees*, i, 130-1; in *The Covent-Garden Tragedy*, i, 130-1; in *The Mock Doctor*, i, 132; in *The Miser*, i, 145; in *Deborah*, i, 146, iii, 297; in *The Intriguing Chambermaid*, i, 154; Fielding dedicates it to her, i, 154-5, 159-60, ii, 366, iii, 219, 298; in *An Old Man Taught Wisdom*, i, 170; in *The Fall of Phaeton*, i, 192, 194; in *Euridice*, i, 206; in *The Beggar's Opera*, i, 211-2; in *Miss Lucy*, i, 369; subscribes for *The Miscellanies*, i, 382; in the burlesque of Juvenal, i, 385; in *Tom Jones*, ii, 174; in *The Upholsterer*, iii, 126; in *The Jealous Wife*, iii, 169; mentioned, i, 143, 148, 155, 157, 177, 374, ii, 73, 366, iii, 266.

COCK, Christopher, i, 213-4, ii, 89.

COCKAYN, Mary, i, 241.

COCKAYNE, Bridget, see Fielding, Bridget (Cockayne).

COCKAYNE, Scipio, i, 13.

*Coffee-House Politician*, first called *Rape upon Rape*, i, 90; described, i, 90-1; produced, i, 92, 95, 97; the watch depicted in, ii, 252; Macklin has rôle in, ii, 410; turned into a farce by Murphy, iii, 126, 154; bibliography, iii, 291-2, 311, 328, 352.

COKAYNE, Sir Aston, i, 13.

COLERIDGE, S. T., on *Jonathan Wild*, i, 425; a chorographic mistake in *Tom Jones*, ii, 152, 164; thought Fielding a master of composition, ii, 161; on *Tom Jones*, ii, 216-7; on the morality of Fielding's novels, iii, 176, 204.

*Collection of poems*, iii, 327.

COLLIER, Arthur, father of Jane and Margaret, ii, 12, iii, 11.

COLLIER, Arthur, brother of Jane and Margaret, ii, 42-4, 302, iii, 57, 150.

COLLIER, Jane, childhood, ii, 12; collaborates with Sarah Fielding on *The Cry*, iii, 10-12; letters to Richardson, ii, 116, iii, 95; visitor at Fielding's house, ii, 302, iii, 10-12; *The Art of Ingeniously Tormenting*, iii, 12; accompanies Fielding to *The Queen of Portugal*, iii, 24, 29; stays at Ryde, iii, 38; correspondence with Fielding, iii, 122; mentioned, ii, 42.

COLLIER, Margaret, childhood, ii, 12; visitor at Fielding's house, ii, 302, iii, 11; perhaps collaborated with Sarah Fielding on *The Cry*, iii, 10-12; witness to Fielding's will, iii, 23; goes to Lisbon with Fielding, iii, 24, 29; stays at Ryde, iii, 38-9; at Lisbon, iii, 54, 56, 58-9; sails for home, iii, 75; perhaps gives silhouette of Fielding to Hogarth, iii, 72; may have aided John Fielding in editing *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 87-8, 91, 96; letter to Richardson from Ryde, iii,

# INDEX

95-7; correspondence with Fielding, iii, 122; mentioned, ii, 42.

COLMAN, George, iii, 169, 352.

COLVILLE, Maud de, i, 2.

Comedian, *The*, i, 125, 141.

Comment on Bolingbroke, *see* Bolingbroke.

Common Sense, established by Chesterfield and Lyttelton, i, 218; Fielding contributes to, i, 220-2, 233, 239, 244, 334; *The Vision of the Golden Bump*, i, 226; mentioned, i, 232, 238, 249, 270, 295, 387, 409, iii, 301.

Compleat History of the Rebellion, ii, 54-7, iii, 311, 314-5.

CONGREVE, William, i, 62, 64-5, 77, 139-40, 152, 197, ii, 116, 160, 228, 434, 437, iii, 79, 140, 280.

CONWAY, H. B., iii, 358.

COOKE, Thomas, probable author of *Jack the Gyant-Killer*, i, 93, and of *Battle of the Poets*, i, 95-7, iii, 341, 350; writes a Prologue to *Tom Thumb*, i, 95; translates Hesiod, i, 96; establishes *The Comedian*, i, 125; writes epigram for it, i, 141; at sale of Fielding's library, iii, 82; also i, 113 n.

COOPER, Elizabeth, i, 198.

COOPER, Mary, bookseller, successor to Thomas Cooper, publishes *The Causidicade*, iii, 343, *Serious Address*, iii, 310, *History of the Present Rebellion*, ii, 55, 56 n, iii, 310, *Dialogue between the Devil . . .*, iii, 312, *True Patriot*, ii, 18, 23, 38, iii, 312, *Female Husband*, ii, 51, iii, 313, *History of the Late Rebellion*, ii, 55, iii, 314, *A Dialogue between a Gentleman of London . . .*, iii, 315, *Proper Answer*, iii, 315, *Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 64, iii, 315-6, *Letter to John Trot-Plaid*, ii, 88, *Important Triflers*, ii, 136, iii, 316, *Pompey the Little*, iii, 345, *March*

*of the Lion*, ii, 405, *Letter from Henry Woodward*, iii, 348; mentioned, ii, 39.

COOPER, Thomas, bookseller, publishes *The Champion*, i, 251, iii, 302, *The Opposition*, i, 298, iii, 305, *Letter to a Noble Lord*, iii, 343.

COPE, Sir John, ii, 13.

CORBETT, Charles, bookseller, publishes *True Greatness* and *The Vernoniad*, i, 287-8, iii, 303; associated with other publishers in *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 64, iii, 316.

CORREA DA SERRA, Abbé, iii, 67.

COTES, Francis, ii, 60.

COTTINGTON, Mrs. Catherine, lived with the Fieldings, i, 21, 26-8; directed to sue Colonel Fielding for debt, i, 38-9.

Country Journal, *see* Craftsman.

COURTNEIDGE, Robert, iii, 358.

Covent-Garden Journal, begun by Fielding, ii, 268, 340, 357-9, 362; Fielding as editor, ii, 364-5, 368-9, 373-7, 379-85, 424, iii, 5, 81, 222, 274; other contributors to, ii, 369-73, 377-85; Fielding's cases reported in, ii, 224 n; Fielding encourages prosecutors, ii, 282; Fielding on the increase of murders, ii, 268-9; urges reform of the penal code, ii, 363; Fielding's translations from the Latin, ii, 138; Court of Censorial Enquiry, ii, 342, 413-7; Fielding recommends Dr. Thompson, iii, 3; praises Richardson, iii, 63; the Robinhoodians, ii, 418-9; Fielding's theory of humour illustrated, ii, 431-7, iii, 19; its satire not often personal, ii, 430; becomes storm-centre, ii, 387-8, 392, 396, iii, 137, 249; comes to an end, ii, 427-9, iii, 9; Fielding's leaders selected by Murphy, iii, 127, by Stephen, iii, 129, by Jensen, iii, 131; Murphy has file of

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

the paper, iii, 204; mentioned, ii, 269-71, 350, 360, 400-3, 406, 413, 426, iii, 44; bibliography, iii, 322-4, 329, 333, 335.

*Covent-Garden Journal* (Dublin piracy), ii, 386-7, iii, 323-4.

*Covent-Garden Journal Extraordinary*, ii, 404, iii, 323.

*Covent-Garden Tragedy*, described, i, 127-9, iii, 263-4; performed, i, 129-30; attacked by *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 132-41; imitated by Johnson in *Caelia*, i, 143; revived, i, 157; compared with *Shamela*, i, 310; Mother Haywood in, i, 369; mentioned, i, 125; bibliography, iii, 295, 311, 328, 356, 359.

**COVENTRY**, Francis, ii, 172, 304, iii, 345-6.

Cox, Daniel, ii, 297.

**CRABBE**, George, iii, 170.

**CRADOCK**, Catherine, i, 164-6, 173-4, ii, 330.

**CRADOCK**, Charlotte, *see* Fielding, Charlotte.

**CRADOCK**, Mrs. Elizabeth, i, 163-4, 173, 247, ii, 330, iii, 146.

**CRADOCK**, Mary Penelope, i, 164.

**CRADOCK**, Thomas, i, 170.

*Craftsman, The*, established, i, 103-4; libellous articles in, i, 111; supplemented by *Common Sense*, i, 218; its contributors arrested, i, 238; its circulation shrinks, i, 249; mentioned, i, 95, 182, 258, 408, ii, 64.

**CRASHAW**, Richard, i, 8.

*Crisis, The*, i, 295-7, 307, iii, 304.

**CROMARTY**, Earl of, ii, 65, iii, 40, 42.

*Cry, The*, *see* Fielding, Sarah.

*Cudgel, The*, i, 367, iii, 342-3.

**CUMBERLAND**, Duke of, ii, 18, 33-4, 52, 54, 57, 101, 258.

**CUMBERLAND**, Richard, iii, 171, 206.

**CURLL**, Edmund, i, 83, 273, iii, 270.

*Curse of Sentiment*, iii, 349.

*Daily Advertiser*, *see* *London Daily Advertiser*.

*Daily Gazetteer*, i, 182, 219, 223, 233, 254, 266-7, 269-70, 290, 302, 309, 349, ii, 63, 79, 138, 422, iii, 262, 342.

*Daily Post*, cited in footnotes and bibliography.

**DALTON**, Rev. John, ii, 223.

**DALTON**, Michael, iii, 365.

**DAMPIER**, Thomas, i, 305-6, 309-10.

**DANIEL**, Mrs., iii, 24, 32, 57.

**DANIEL**, Mary, *see* Fielding, Mary (Daniel).

**D'ARBLAY**, Madame, *see* Burney, Frances.

**DAVAUX**, Citizen, iii, 184.

*David Simple*, *see* Fielding, Sarah.

**DAVIDGE**, Sarah, i, 15.

**DAVIES**, Peter, i, 240.

**DAVIES**, Thomas, i, 178, 200.

**DAY**, William, i, 15, 31, 34, 37-8, 239, iii, 359-60.

*Debauchees*, *see* *Old Debauchees*.

**Deborah**, i, 146, iii, 297.

**DEER**, Mrs., i, 29.

**DEFAUCONPRET**, A. J. B., iii, 349-50.

**DEFFAND**, Marquise du, iii, 187.

**DEFOE**, Daniel, i, 407, 415, 424, ii, 158, iii, 79, 175, 240, 263, 341.

**DEFREVAL**, J. B., ii, 149.

**DE LA BORDE**, Anne, i, 21.

**DELANY**, Mrs., i, 188, ii, 310, 346, 349.

*\*DEMOSTHENES*, *see* *First Olynthiac*.

**DENBIGH**, Basil, 2d Earl of, i, 6-9, 19.

**DENBIGH**, Susan (Villiers), Countess of, i, 5-8, 19.

**DENBIGH**, William, 1st Earl of, i, 5-7.

**DENBIGH**, William, 3d Earl of, i, 10, 58.

**DENBIGH**, William, 5th Earl of, i, 3-4, 42, 382, ii, 112-3, iii, 148.

# INDEX

DENNIS, John, i, 96, 99, 100.  
 DENNISON, Justice, ii, 41.  
 DERRICK, Samuel, i, 377.  
*Description of U---n G---*, i, 71-2.  
 DESFAUCHERETS, J. L., iii, 356.  
 DESFONTAINES, Abbé, i, 356, iii, 179.  
 DESFORGES, Pierre, iii, 183, 355.  
 DESMOND, George, Earl of, i, 9-10.  
 DESPRÉS, Jean B. D., iii, 356.  
*Detection and Punishment of Murder*, ii, 269, 280, iii, 128, 324, 334.  
 DE VEIL, Sir Thomas, ii, 89, 96, 223, 226; alluded to, i, 91.  
 DEVONSHIRE, William, 3d Duke of, i, 382.  
*Dialogue between a Gentleman of London . . .*, ii, 58-9, 69, iii, 130, 310, 315.  
*Dialogue between Alexander the Great and . . .*, i, 386, 394, iii, 329.  
*Dialogue between an Alderman and a Courtier*, see *Dialogue between a Gentleman . . .*  
*Dialogue between the Devil, the Pope, and the Pretender*, ii, 15-7, iii, 130, 312.  
 DICKENS, Charles, ii, 201, 335, iii, 188, 229-30.  
 DICKSON, Frederick S., on the bibliography of *Tom Jones*, ii, 121, iii, 178; the time-scheme of the novel, ii, 189-93; inconsistencies in it, ii, 197, 200; chronology of *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 48 n; index to it, iii, 92 n; the first edition of the book, iii, 86 n; Fielding's use of tobacco, iii, 142; on Thackeray's portrait of Fielding, iii, 218, 220; Keightley's essays on Fielding, iii, 248; the Dickson Fielding collection at Yale, i, 295, ii, 185 n, iii, 48 n, 76 n, 92 n, 248-9.  
 DOBSON, Austin, questions Murphy's statements, i, 66; the authorship of *Shamela*, i, 304-5, 307; Astraea Hill's letter to Richardson, ii, 145; essay on James Harris, ii, 384 n; Fielding's letters to his brother John, iii, 41-3, 52, 55-6, 59, 64; on Fielding's library, iii, 76; two versions of *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 85, 86 n, 130; his acquaintance with Fielding's miscellaneous writings, iii, 125; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 247-55, 269; bibliography, iii, 326-7, 346, 364.

DODD, A., and Mrs. A., i, 296, 307, ii, 18, 52, 358-9, iii, 290, 303-4, 322-3.  
 DODD, Dr. James S., ii, 297.  
 DODD, James W., iii, 105.  
 DODD, William, iii, 357.  
 DODINGTON, George Bubb, i, 144, 250-1, 288-9, 382, 384, ii, 18, 20, iii, 266.  
 DODSLEY, Robert, i, 225.  
*Don Quixote in England*, Fielding sketches it, i, 70, iii, 144, 264; submits it to Cibber and Booth, i, 74; performed, i, 156-7, 178; described, i, 157-60; published, iii, 298; relation to *Squire Badger*, iii, 154, mentioned, i, 179; bibliography, iii, 298, 311, 328, 354.  
 DONNE, John, i, 168.  
 DONNELLAN, Mrs., ii, 349.  
*Dramatic Sessions*, i, 161.  
*Dramatic Works*, collected edition, iii, 80, 311-2.  
 DRAWCANSIR, Sir Alexander, name assumed by Fielding, ii, 358; see also *Covent-Garden Journal*.  
 DRURY, Robert, i, 198, 202, 217.  
*Drury-Lane Journal*, ii, 341, 401-4, 412, 419.  
 DRYDEN, John, i, 86-7, 100-1, 139-40, 191, 399, ii, 53, iii, 79, 279.  
 DUCK, Stephen, i, 96, ii, 245.  
 DULLWIN, P., ii, 402-3.  
 DUMAS, A., iii, 190.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

DYER, Edward, i, 18.

DYSON, Jeremiah, iii, 82.

EDGEWORTH, Maria, iii, 207.

EDWARDS, Sampson, iii, 348.

EDWARDS, Thomas, iii, 97.

ELIOT, George, ii, 222, iii, 230.

ELIOTT, General, iii, 83.

ELLYS, John, i, 147-8.

ELWIN, Rev. Whitwell, iii, 228.

*Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers*, ii, 255-68, 271, 273, 276-7, 280, 311-2, 401, iii, 80, 83, 99, 320, 329.

*Epilogue*, to be spoken by Mrs. Woffington, ii, 32.

*Epilogue to Caelia*, see Johnson, Charles.

*Epistle to Mr. Fielding*, i, 243.

*Epistle to Walpole*, iii, 128, 327; see also Walpole, Sir Robert.

*Essay on Conversation*, in prose, i, 387, iii, 329, 341.

*Essay on Conversation*, in verse, iii, 341.

*Essay on Nothing*, i, 390, 394, iii, 128, 330.

*Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men*, i, 388, iii, 103, 329.

ETHEREGE, Sir George, i, 77.

*Eurydice*, see *Eurydice*.

*European Magazine*, iii, 67.

*Eurydice*, described, i, 205-6; riot at attempted performance of, i, 206-7, 216; published, i, 385-6; bibliography, iii, 300, 328.

*Eurydice Hiss'd*, performed, i, 216; described, i, 216-7, iii, 142, 273; published, i, 222; bibliography, iii, 301, 311, 328.

EUSDEN, Laurence, i, 96.

*Euthalia*, i, 55.

*Examination of Glastonbury Water*, ii, 360-2, iii, 346.

*Extempore in the Pump Room*, i, 377-8, iii, 330.

*Examples of the Interposition of Providence . . .*, see *Detection and Punishment*.

*Extracts from the Penal Laws*, iii, 98, 327.

*Faithful Narrative*, see Smollett.

*Familiar Letters*, ii, 54, iii, 314, 328, 333-4.

FARQUHAR, George, iii, 79.

*Fatal Curiosity*, i, 200-1, 210, iii, 300; see also Lillo, George.

*Fathers*, *The*, Fielding revises this unacted play for Garrick, i, 372, iii, 100-1; story of the manuscript, iii, 100-1; Garrick revises it, iii, 102-6, 109, and writes prologue and epilogue for it, iii, 329; produced by Sheridan, iii, 104-8; published, iii, 104, 108; bibliography, iii, 128, 329-30.

FAULKENER, Dublin publisher, ii, 267.

FEILDING, see Fielding.

*Female Free Mason*, i, 217.

*Female Husband*, ii, 51, iii, 313.

*Female Quixote*, see Lennox, Charlotte.

FIELDING, spelling of the name, i, 3-4.

FIELDING, Allen (son of Henry), iii, 23, 75, 117, 122, 123.

FIELDING, Allen (great-grandson of Henry), iii, 123.

FIELDING, Anne (sister of Henry), i, 20, 26.

FIELDING, Anne or Eleanor (second wife of Edmund), i, 26-33, 38, 40.

FIELDING, Basil, 2d Earl of Denbigh, see Denbigh.

FIELDING, Basil (4th son of the 1st Earl of Desmond), i, 10.

FIELDING, Beatrice (sister of

# INDEX

Henry), i, 20, 240-1, ii, 248, iii, 359-60.

FIELDING, Bridget (Cockayne), grandmother of Henry, i, 13.

FIELDING, Bridget (Stanhope), i, 9.

FIELDING, Bridget (aunt of Henry), i, 13.

FIELDING, Catherine (sister of Henry), i, 17 n, 19, 26, 240-1, 248, iii, 359-60.

FIELDING, Sir Charles (3d son of the 1st Earl of Desmond), i, 10.

FIELDING, Charles (grandson of Henry), iii, 123.

FIELDING, Charlotte (first wife of Henry), Fielding's courtship and marriage, i, 93-5, 164-70, 369, ii, 171, iii, 113, 145-6, 198, 270; her appearance, i, 166-8, ii, 60, iii, 120; Sophia Western as a portrait of, ii, 170, 208-9; relation to Amelia, ii, 329-31, 334, iii, 198; Richardson's slur upon her, ii, 218, iii, 210, 235, 238, 256; Lawrence on, iii, 235-6; Stephen on, iii, 243; gets her mother's estate, i, 173; in George Fielding's will, i, 241; conveys lands in East Stour, i, 240, iii, 360; goes to London, i, 177; lives at Salisbury, i, 246; illness and death, i, 351-2, ii, 10-11, iii, 150, 198, 210, 272.

FIELDING, Charlotte (daughter of Henry), i, 177, 351, 375, 388.

FIELDING, Dorothy (aunt of Henry), i, 13, 163 n.

FIELDING, Edmund (father of Henry), birth, i, 13; army life, i, 14; gambling debts, i, 24-6, 39; marriage with Sarah Gould, i, 15; at East Stour, i, 19, iii, 146; marriage with Anne Rapha, i, 26; domestic troubles, i, 27-38; later marriages, i, 40; children, i, 16, 20, 29, 39, iii, 135, 209; death, i, 40; parallel to Lieut. Booth, ii, 332, 334; mentioned, i, 56, 198.

FIELDING, Edmund (brother of Henry), i, 20, 29-30, 32, 37, 174, 239-41, iii, 91, 359-60.

FIELDING, Elizabeth (aunt of Henry), i, 13.

FIELDING, Ernest, iii, 73.

FIELDING, Everard, i, 5.

FIELDING, Geoffrey, i, 4.

FIELDING, George, 1st Earl of Desmond, *see* Desmond.

FIELDING, George (2d son of 1st Earl of Desmond), i, 10.

FIELDING, Lt. Col. George (uncle of Henry), i, 13, 241, iii, 146.

FIELDING, George (half-brother of Henry), ii, 112-3.

FIELDING, George, iii, 364.

FIELDING, Harriot, or Harriet, (daughter of Henry), birth, i, 239, iii, 23; voyage to Lisbon, iii, 24, 29, 54, 56, 58, 75; companion of Elizabeth Chudleigh, iii, 117-20; marries Lieut. Col. Montresor, iii, 119-21; in her father's will, iii, 22-3, 75; death, iii, 121; mentioned, ii, 12, 109.

FIELDING, Henry.

[The persons named under this heading are also entered separately in this index, with complete references.

A complete list of Fielding's works, in the order of publication, is given on pp. 289-335; those of uncertain or doubtful authorship on pp. 335-40; and those erroneously attributed to him on pp. 340-50. Each of these works is entered under its title in this index.]

Ancestry. Genealogy, i, 1-5; the Earls of Denbigh, i, 5-9; the direct line, i, 9-14; *see also* the entries under the names of his father (Ed-

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

mund Fielding), his mother (Sarah Gould), and other ancestors.

*Birth and childhood.* Date of birth, i, 16-7; place of birth, i, 16; life at Sharpham Park, i, 16-9; at East Stour, i, 19-24, 26; at Lady Gould's, i, 35-6, 39; his brother and sisters (see Anne, Beatrice, Catherine, Edmund, Sarah, Ursula); his half-brothers and sisters, i, 29, 39; fondness for his half-brother John, i, 39; opposition to his stepmother, Anne Rapha, i, 28-9.

*Education.* His education at home, i, 22, 27-9; goes to Eton, i, 29, 41; at Eton, i, 32-4; runs away, i, 34-5, but returns, i, 36, 41; his schoolmates, i, 41-2; the curriculum, i, 42-8; his life there, i, 48-9; leaves Eton and travels in the West, i, 50-3; reads the classics, i, 53; in London, i, 53, 55-7; publishes *The Masquerade*, i, 53, 60-1; prepares and produces *Love in Several Masques* for the stage, i, 53, 61-2; *To Euthalia*, i, 55; an allowance promised by his father, i, 57-8, 72; obtains patronage of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, i, 58; goes to Leyden, i, 65; his studies there, i, 66-8; life there, i, 68-73; sketches *Don Quixote in England*, i, 70; returns to London, i, 74.

*Courtship and marriage.* Fails to win Sarah Andrew, i, 50-5; marries Charlotte Cradock, i, 163-70; his children, Charlotte, i, 177, and Harriot, i, 239; marries Mary Daniel, ii, 60; his children, William, ii, 61, Mary Amelia, ii, 225, Sophia, ii, 248, Louisa, ii, 302, Allen, iii, 23.

*Dramatic career.* His *Don Quixote* found unsuitable, i, 74; writes *The Temple Beau*, i, 74, produced at Goodman's Fields, i, 76-7; falls in with James Ralph; epistles to Walpole,

i, 75-6, 113; throws in his lot with the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, i, 79; *The Author's Farce* produced there, i, 80, and *Tom Thumb*, i, 85; *The Coffee-House Politician*, i, 92, 95, 97; enlarges his *Tom Thumb*, and renames it *The Tragedy of Tragedies*, i, 98; it is produced with *The Letter Writers*, i, 98; writes his own playbills, i, 98; burlesques Walpole in *The Welsh Opera*, which is performed, i, 107; Fielding rewrites it and renames it *The Grub-Street Opera*, i, 108, which may have been performed, i, 111; his season at the Haymarket ends disastrously, i, 112; Fielding is attacked in *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 112, and by Hoadly in *The Contrast*, i, 112; quarrel with *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 121-41; goes over to Drury Lane, with the best actors from the Haymarket, i, 115-6; produces *The Lottery*, i, 117, ii, 50; writes epilogue for *The Modish Couple*, i, 118; *The Modern Husband*, i, 119-21; letters to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, i, 118-9, iii, 359; *The Old Debauchees*, i, 125, 127, 132, ii, 32, and *The Covent-Garden Tragedy* performed together, i, 129-31; *The Mock Doctor*, i, 131, 202, 217, 371, iii, 106, 153; writes epilogue for *Caelia*, i, 143; the theatrical war, i, 142-162; *The Miser*, i, 143, 146, 337-8, 369, ii, 50, iii, 153, 233-4; *Deborah*, i, 146; revises *The Author's Farce*, i, 149-54, iii, 144; *The Intriguing Chambermaid*, i, 149-53, 155, iii, 154; *Don Quixote*, i, 156-9, 178; *An Old Man Taught Wisdom*, i, 170, 217, 369; *The Universal Gallant*, i, 171-2; organizes his own dramatic company, i, 178-204, and produces *Pasquin*, i, 180, 187-9, 191, iii, 146, 155; *Tumble-Down Dick*, i, 194-5,

# INDEX

198, 200-1; brings out other pieces than his own, i, 198-202; writes prologue for *Fatal Curiosity*, i, 200; Fielding's attacks on the Ministry the cause of the Licensing Act, i, 205-37; *Euridice*, i, 206-7, 216; *A Rehearsal of Kings*, i, 208-10, and *Sir Peevy Pet*, i, 208-9; *Historical Register*, i, 209, 218, 220, iii, 146; *Eurydice Hiss'd*, i, 216; warned in *The Daily Gazetteer*, i, 219-20; answered by Fielding in *Common Sense*, i, 220-2; Fielding's theatre closed, i, 232-8; reworks old plays, i, 368; *Miss Lucy in Town*, i, 369-70, 374; Fielding's friendship with Garrick, i, 371; *The Wedding Day*, i, 373-5, 381, iii, 100, 143-4, 227; *The Good Natur'd Man*, i, 372, afterwards called *The Fathers*, iii, 100-8.

*Journalistic career.* Publishes *The Champion*, i, 251, q. v., under the pseudonym of Capt. Hercules Vinegar, q. v.; his interest in it wanes, i, 257, 259, and ceases, i, 259; *The True Patriot*, ii, 18-42; *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 64-93; *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 357-86; attacked by Kenrick, Hill, Thornton, Smollett, and others, ii, 386-432.

*His miscellaneous tracts and papers.* Perhaps translates Adlerfeld's *History of Charles XII*, i, 285; *True Greatness*, i, 251, 288-91, 384; *Vernoniad*, i, 291-6, 301, 364, 383; appeals to the electors in *The Crisis*, i, 295; may have written *The Plain Truth*, i, 297; *The Opposition*, i, 298; burlesques Richardson in *Shamela*, i, 303; *Full Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough*, i, 361; projects a translation of Aristophanes, i, 362, and publishes *Plutus*, i, 363-6; *Chrysipus*, i, 390; brings out his *Miscellanies*, i, 380; *A Serious Address*,

ii, 14; *A Dialogue between the Devil*, ii, 15-7; *The Female Husband*, ii, 51; *Ovid's Art of Love Paraphrased*, ii, 52-4; *Compleat History of the Rebellion*, ii, 54-7; *A Dialogue between a Gentleman of London*, ii, 58; *The Important Triflers*, ii, 136-8; *Stultus versus Sapientem*, ii, 137-9; *Proper Answer*, ii, 74, 76; *True State of the Case of Bosavern Penlez*, ii, 238; *Enquiry into the Cause*, ii, 255; *Examples of the Interposition of Providence*, ii, 269; *Clear State of the Case of Elizabeth Canning*, ii, 294; *Comment on Lord Bolingbroke's Essays*, iii, 17-20; collaboration with William Young on Latin and Greek dictionaries, iii, 80-2.

*His novels.* Fielding's equipment as a novelist, i, 314; his theory of humour, i, 331-41, ii, 434-7; *Joseph Andrews*, i, 315-49; *Jonathan Wild*, i, 380, 403-25; *Tom Jones*, ii, 99-222; *Amelia*, ii, 301-56.

*Legal career.* Settles in London soon after his marriage, i, 170; his distress, i, 172-3; division of his mother's property, i, 239-42; decides to become a lawyer, i, 242, and reads law, i, 242-6, 248-9, 258; called to the bar, i, 258; illness and affliction, i, 351, 373, 375; the practice of the law insufficient for his support, i, 375; borrows money and is unable to pay, i, 375-6; his friends help him, i, 376-7; meets Jane Husband at Bath, and writes verses to her, i, 377; publishes his *Miscellanies*, and then devotes himself to the law, ii, 1-4; *The Causidicade* and other pamphlets were attributed to him, ii, 4-6; also his sister Sarah's *David Simple*, ii, 7; Fielding writes a preface for the second edition, ii, 8; his wife Charlotte dies, ii, 11; the invasion of England

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

by Charles Edward arouses him, and he publishes *A Serious Address*, ii, 14, and *A Dialogue between the Devil and the Pretender*, ii, 15-7; launches *The True Patriot*, ii, 18-20; his private affairs in great confusion, ii, 42; the Collier case, ii, 42-4; Joseph Warton visits him, ii, 45; contributes to his sister Sarah's *Familiar Letters*, ii, 47; marries Mary Daniel, ii, 60-2; edits *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 64; suspected of having written *The Tryal of J. Perceval*, ii, 94-5; writes *Tom Jones*, ii, 100-8; appointed as Bow Street Justice, ii, 96; and as Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, ii, 98, 224; begins to rid Middlesex of thieves and robbers, ii, 98, 223; his half-brother John and he open a Universal Register office, ii, 226; John is appointed assistant justice in Bow Street, ii, 226; Fielding's clerk and constables, ii, 226; Fielding as a Bow Street justice, ii, 223-34, 301-2; becomes chairman of the Quarter Sessions, ii, 230, and publishes his *Charge*, ii, 230-3; the riots of 1749, ii, 234-49; Bosavern Penlez, ii, 236; applies for position as solicitor to the Excise, ii, 242; gets pension from the Duke of Bedford, ii, 242-3; asks a commission for Brogden, ii, 244; recommends Edward Moore as deputy-licenser of the stage, ii, 244; has severe attack of gout, ii, 247; his war against robbery and murder, ii, 250-300; sends to Lord Hardwicke the draft of a bill for preventing street robberies, ii, 243-4, 254; the bill becomes an Act, ii, 277; recommends Pentlow as keeper of the Clerkenwell prison, ii, 253; the case of Elizabeth Canning, ii, 285; his sister Sarah mainly dependent upon him, ii, 302; his income, expenses,

charities, ii, 302-3; publishes *Amelia*, ii, 304; asks that Saunders Welch be appointed a justice of the peace, iii, 13; his half-brother John succeeds him, iii, 13.

*Fielding's pseudonyms*, see Drawcansir, Sir Alexander; Gulliver, Lemuel; Pasquin; Philalethes; Scriblerus Secundus; Trottplaid, John; Vinegar, Capt. Hercules; also title-pages of *The Crisis*, *Shamela*, *Some Papers Proper to be Read*, and *Tumble-Down Dick*, as given in the bibliography; his initials in *The Champion*, i, 255-6; in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 365-8; fanciful names assumed in his periodicals, i, 256-7, ii, 27, 39-41, 70-1, 81, 87, 367-70, 375-6, 382.

*Fielding's residences*. Sharpham Park, i, 16-9; East Stour, i, 19-24, 26; Lady Gould's at Salisbury, i, 35-6, 39; goes back to Salisbury, i, 93-5; settles in London, i, 170; retires to East Stour for rest, i, 174-5, iii, 1, 272; returns to London, i, 177; residence while studying law, i, 246-9; Pump Court, i, 258; Salisbury Cathedral Close, i, 246-8, 350, iii, 272; Milford Hill, i, 247, 350; Spring Gardens, i, 350; Twerton, i, 379, ii, 110, iii, 272; Widcombe, i, 379, iii, 272; Old Boswell Court, ii, 11-2, 45, 109, iii, 149, 272; Back Lane, Twickenham, ii, 60-1, 109, iii, 150, 272; Barnes, in Surrey, ii, 109; Fordhook House, Ealing, ii, 109, 289-90, 302, iii, 15, 272; Bow Street, ii, 111-2.

*Last illness*, iii, 1-21; begins his *Comment on Belingbroke's Essays*, iii, 17-20; sails for Lisbon, iii, 22; begins *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 30; ship-letter to his brother, iii, 31-2; at Ryde, iii, 33-9; in Tor Bay, iii, 40-5, where he writes again to John,

# INDEX

iii, 41-3; lands at Lisbon, iii, 51; his long ship-letter to his brother, iii, 52-8; his household at Junqueira, iii, 58-65; his death, iii, 65; his grave, iii, 65-70; Fielding's widow and daughter return to England, iii, 75; Fielding's estate and will, iii, 22-3, 75, 364; his library, iii, 75-83; *A Voyage to Lisbon* published, iii, 84; other manuscripts, including *A Treatise on the Office of Constable*, and *The Fathers*, iii, 97-111; the survivors, iii, 112-24.

*Personal appearance and portraits*, i, 48-9, 58, 280, ii, 407, iii, 70-4.

*His fame in France and Germany*, iii, 177-94.

*Adaptations and imitations of his plays and novels*, ii, 133-6, 304, iii, 155-7, 169-71, 181-4, 345, 348-58.

*General estimates of Fielding's verse*, iii, 153, of his plays, iii, 153-7, of his novels, iii, 157-76.

*Estimates of Fielding and his works*. By Dr. Aikin, iii, 196, 199-200; Dr. Robert Anderson, iii, 164; Jane Austen, iii, 172; Mrs. Barbauld, iii, 199-202; N. T. Barthe, iii, 187; James Beattie, iii, 167; *Blackwood's Magazine*, iii, 228; Hugh Blair, iii, 169; C. F. Blankenburg, iii, 193; Boswell, iii, 161-2; Charlotte Brontë, iii, 231-2; W. H. Brown, iii, 175; J. P. Browne, iii, 239; Mary Brunton, iii, 207; Frances Burney, iii, 155, 160; Samuel Butler, iii, 253; Lord Byron, iii, 204; Thomas Campbell, iii, 170; George Canning, iii, 173; Alexander Chalmers, iii, 203-4; S. T. Coleridge, i, 425, iii, 176, 204; George Colman, iii, 169; George Crabbe, iii, 170; Richard Cumberland, iii, 171; Madame du Deffand, iii, 187; Dickens, iii, 229; Dobson, iii, 247-55, 269;

George Eliot, iii, 230; Rev. W. Elwin, iii, 228; Sir John Fielding, iii, 151; William Forsyth, iii, 239; Gibbon, iii, 168; George Gilfillan, iii, 227; William Godwin, iii, 164, 167, 169; Goethe, iii, 194; Goldsmith, iii, 161; Gray, i, 358-9; Emanuel Green, iii, 247; Thomas Green, iii, 172; James Harris, iii, 151; Sir John Hawkins, iii, 162, 167, 169, 171; Hazlitt, iii, 161, 205-6; W. E. Henley, iii, 253-7; Dr. John Hill, iii, 157; M. Davenport Hill, iii, 228-30; John Oliver Hobbes, iii, 175-6; Richard Hurd, iii, 137; J. H. Jesse, iii, 239; Samuel Johnson, ii, 338-9, iii, 157-9, 167; Thomas Keightley, iii, 236-8; F. G. Klopstock, iii, 194; V. Knox, iii, 169; La Harpe, iii, 187; Charles Lamb, iii, 206; Frederick Lawrence, iii, 232-8; G. E. Lessing, iii, 193-4; G. C. Lichtenberg, iii, 194; *London Chronicle*, iii, 154; J. R. Lowell, iii, 230, 251-2; Lord Lyttelton, iii, 151, 167-8; Lord Lytton, iii, 230; T. B. Macaulay, iii, 173-5; T. J. Mathias, iii, 172; Lord Monboddo, iii, 168; Elizabeth Montagu, iii, 160-1; Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, iii, 237; *Monthly Review*, iii, 153; Edward Moore, iii, 137; John Moore, iii, 163-4; Thomas Moore, iii, 204-5; Hannah More, iii, 159; William Mudford, iii, 201-3; Arthur Murphy, iii, 132-4, 147, 204; John Nichols, iii, 204; E. A. Poe, iii, 230; Joseph Reed, iii, 169-70; Clara Reeve, iii, 171-2; Sir Joshua Reynolds, iii, 161; Richardson, ii, 349-51, iii, 157; Samuel Rogers, iii, 156; Thomas Roscoe, iii, 213; Rousseau, iii, 187; Schiller, iii, 194; Scott, ii, 323, iii, 166-7, 207-13; Sheridan, iii, 156; Charlotte Smith, iii, 206; Smollett, iii, 157; Southey, iii, 206;

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

iii, 205, 232; Stendhal, iii, 187; Sir Leslie Stephen, iii, 239-48, 253; Swift, iii, 155; Taine, iii, 187-9; Texte, iii, 178, 180; Thackeray, iii, 213-26, 229, 231-2, 234, 236, 238-9, 253-5; Voltaire, iii, 187; Horace Walpole, iii, 157, 163, 187, 237; William Warburton, iii, 169; Joseph Warton, iii, 155, 167; William Watson, iii, 196-9; E. P. Whipple, iii, 226-7; Dorothy Wordsworth, iii, 172-3; William Wordsworth, iii, 172.

*Fielding's editors and biographers.*  
See the entries under Dr. John Aikin, Mrs. Barbauld, James P. Browne, J. Paul de Castro, Alexander Chalmers, Frederick S. Dickson, Austin Dobson, Miss G. M. Godden, Edmund Gosse, W. E. Henley, Dr. G. E. Jensen, Thomas Keightley, Dr. Andrew Kippis, Andrew Lang, Frederick Lawrence, William Mudford, Arthur Murphy, John Nichols, F. J. Pope, W. H. Pyne, Sir Walter Raleigh, Thomas Roscoe, G. E. B. Saintsbury, Sir Walter Scott, Sir Leslie Stephen, W. M. Thackeray, William Watson, Dr. J. E. Wells, Sir M. W. Wraxall.

*Summary of Fielding's character and achievements*, iii, 258-86.

**FIELDING**, Henry (grandson of Henry), iii, 123.

**FIELDING**, Henry (born 1861), iii, 123.

**FIELDING**, John (remote ancestor of Henry), i, 4.

**FIELDING**, John (grandfather of Henry), i, 10-3, 19, ii, 330.

**FIELDING**, Governor John (uncle of Henry), i, 13.

**FIELDING**, Sir John (Henry's blind half-brother), birth, i, 39, ii, 225; lives with Henry in London, ii, 225, 228, iii, 210; the Universal Register Office, ii, 226, 266, 359, 402-3, 428,

iii, 321; at Bow Street, ii, 243, 248, 302, iii, 12-3, 16, 114-5; on robbers, ii, 283-5; on MacDaniel the informer, iii, 245; pamphlets on crime, iii, 98-9, 114, 327-8, 334; uses Z. Z. as anonym, ii, 361, 377-8, iii, 346; shareholder in *The Public Advertiser*, ii, 428; marriages, ii, 248, iii, 123 n; friendship with Miss Chudleigh, iii, 119; his character, iii, 115-6; praises Henry, iii, 109, 151; engages passage for Henry to Lisbon, iii, 22; Henry sends him cider, iii, 40, and onions, iii, 57; Henry's letters to, iii, 30, 32-3, 41-3, 52-8, 64, 248, 250, 364; administration of Henry's estate, iii, 75, 116-8; sells Henry's annotated books and manuscripts, iii, 80; publishes Henry's legal manuscripts, iii, 98-9; owned Henry's extracts from philosophers, iii, 19, and his Crown Law, iii, 83, 134, 366; edits *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 60, 83-4, 87-92; Garrick and *The Good-Natur'd Man*, iii, 100-2, 106-9, 329; mentioned, iii, 123.

**FIELDING**, Louisa (daughter of Henry), ii, 302.

**FIELDING**, Mary Amelia (daughter of Henry), ii, 225, 248.

**FIELDING**, Mary (Daniel), in Henry's household, ii, 12; he marries her, ii, 60, 109, iii, 150, 270; her character, ii, 61-2, 228, iii, 137; the informer MacDaniel, iii, 245-6, 253; voyage to Lisbon, iii, 24, 29, 54-6, 58, 75; in Henry's will, iii, 22, 75-6, 116; *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 85, 87; *The Good-Natur'd Man*, iii, 100, 106, 108; Murphy's acquaintance with, iii, 85, 134; death, iii, 123.

**FIELDING**, Richard, i, 7.

**FIELDING**, Robert (Beau Fielding), iii, 147.

# INDEX

FIELDING, Sarah Gould (mother of Henry), birth, i, 15; marries Edmund Fielding, i, 15-6, 30, 32; birth of Henry, i, 16-7; life at Sharpham Park, i, 17-9; other children, i, 19-20; moves to East Stour, i, 19; death of father, i, 20; domestic life, i, 20-1, 24, 26; death, i, 26; her estate placed in trust, i, 239, iii, 146.

FIELDING, Sarah (sister of Henry), birth, i, 20; division of her mother's estate, i, 240-1; lives with Henry, ii, 12, 302; survives him, ii, 248; friend of Richardson, i, 305, 309, ii, 61, iii, 38, 112-3, 282; at Ryde, iii, 38; at Bath, iii, 112; death, iii, 113-4; Mudford's estimate of, iii, 202; *David Simple*, ii, 6, 8-10, 46, 173, 208; *Familiar Letters*, ii, 46-51; *Cleopatra*, ii, 52; *The Governess*, ii, 116; *The Cry*, iii, 12, iii, 10-2; later writings, iii, 113; may have contributed to *Joseph Andrews*, i, 353, *The True Patriot*, ii, 39-40, *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 92, *The Detection of Murder*, ii, 270, *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 377-8, but not to *The Adventurer*, ii, 424; mentioned, iii, 134, 149, 261; bibliography, iii, 309-11, 314, 344, 347, 349, 359-60.

FIELDING, Sophia (daughter of Henry), ii, 248, iii, 22-3, 75, 117-8.

FIELDING, Sophia (granddaughter of Henry), iii, 73.

FIELDING, Timothy, mistaken for the novelist, iii, 233.

FIELDING, Ursula (sister of Henry), i, 17, 19, 240-1, 248, iii, 359-60.

FIELDING, William, of Newnham Paddox (remote ancestor), i, 4.

FIELDING, William (died 1471), i, 4.

FIELDING, William, 1st Earl of Denbigh, *see* Denbigh.

FIELDING, William, 3d Earl of Denbigh, *see* Denbigh.

FIELDING, William, 5th Earl of Denbigh, *see* Denbigh.

FIELDING, William (uncle of Henry), i, 18.

FIELDING, William (half-brother of Henry), iii, 91.

FIELDING, William (son of Henry), ii, 61, 109, 225, iii, 23, 75, 117, 121-2, 366.

FIELDING, William Henry (grandson of Henry), iii, 121, 365-6.

*First Olynthiac of Demosthenes*, i, 386, iii, 329.

FITZPATRICK, Richard, ii, 423-5.

FLEETWOOD, Charles, i, 155-6, 177-8, 188, 193, 205, 222, 372, 382, iii, 100.

FLETCHER, John, iii, 79.

*Fog's Weekly Journal*, i, 182-3, 238.

FOOTE, Samuel, ii, 88-9, 232, 407, 413, iii, 279, 351.

FORD, James, i, 285-7, iii, 338.

FORSYTH, Helen, iii, 358.

FORSYTH, William, iii, 239.

FOSTER, Justice, ii, 41.

FOX, Henry, i, 42, ii, 47, iii, 266.

FRANCIS, Mrs., iii, 35, 44, 85, 91, 94.

FRANCIS, Philip, ii, 174.

FRANCKLIN, Richard, i, 104.

FRANCKLIN, Thomas, ii, 245.

FRANKLIN, Benjamin, i, 74, ii, 105.

FREDERICK, Prince of Wales, at performance of *Tom Thumb*, i, 88; in *The Welsh Opera*, i, 106; translation of Molière dedicated to, i, 144; at *The Opera of Operas*, i, 147; patron of theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, i, 153; and of Farinelli at the Opera House, i, 178; relation to the Country Party, i, 179; marriage, i, 194; at Drury Lane Theatre, i, 194; subscribes for the *Miscellanies*,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

i, 382; relation to Lyttelton, ii, 63; elegy on his death, ii, 381; Dr. Thompson, his physician, iii, 3.

FREEMAN, Ralph (pseudonym of Thomas Pitt), i, 266-9, 271, 277, 283, ii, 95.

FREEMAN, Samuel, iii, 74.

FREKE, John, ii, 105-6.

FRÉRON, Elie C., iii, 187.

FROUDE, Philip, i, 161.

*Full Answer*, see *Proper Answer*.

*Full Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough*, see *Marlborough*.

*Fun*, see Kenrick, William.

GAIN de Montagnac, L. L. J., iii, 180, 349.

GARRICK, David, comes into fame, i, 77, 370; manager of Drury Lane, i, 187, ii, 393, 413, at Covent Garden, ii, 50; Macklin breaks with him, ii, 411; his relation to Mossop, ii, 415-6, to Havard, ii, 416; war with Rich, ii, 416-24, 426; not the author of Woodward's *Letter*, ii, 425, iii, 348; in Dance's *Pamela*, i, 302, 371; in *Richard III*, i, 371; in *The Mock Doctor*, i, 371, iii, 106; in *The Rehearsal*, i, 371; in *The Wedding Day*, i, 372-5, iii, 100, 143-4; in *The upholsterer*, iii, 126; in *The Jealous Wife*, iii, 169; subscribes to *Miscellanies*, i, 382, in which he is praised, i, 384; in *The Patriot Analyzed*, ii, 73; Foote mimics him, ii, 89; his adaptation of *Cenie*, ii, 367; not a contributor to *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 385; on Smollett's *Regicide*, ii, 397-8; Smollett pillories him, ii, 398; shareholder in *The Public Advertiser*, ii, 428; Ode on Pelham and Bolingbroke, iii, 16-7; Hogarth's portrait of Fielding, iii, 71-2; induces Fielding to complete *The Good-Natur'd Man*, i, 372,

iii, 100; Garrick revises it, and writes prologue and epilogue for it, iii, 102-6, 109, 329; attends its first performance, iii, 105; relation to Sir John Fielding, iii, 101-2; Sheridan succeeds him at Drury Lane, iii, 104; reworks *The Irish Widow*, iii, 106; Fielding praises his acting, ii, 127, 176, 192, 264; Fielding's friendship with, i, 235, 371-2, 411, iii, 134, 191, 266; mentioned, iii, 185, 236.

GASCOYNE, Sir Crisp, ii, 289, 294, 296, 298.

GAY, John, *The Beggar's Opera*, i, 80, 134, 166, 202, 220, iii, 157, 264, 278-9; Cibber refuses it, i, 61; its popularity, i, 58-9, 93, 188; its relation to Fielding's *Welsh Opera*, i, 104-5, 109, 128, 225; Mrs. Clive in, i, 211; the Government prohibits his *Polly*, i, 408; mentioned, i, 264, 421, ii, 116.

*Gazetteer*, see *Daily Gazetteer*.

GENEST, John, i, 111, iii, 103, 294, 296, 297.

*Gentleman's Magazine*, i, 358, 361, 370, ii, 4, 52, 130-2, 136, 140-1, 157, 193, 224, 254, 267, 296, 298, 309, 345, 361, 414, 421-2, 426, iii, 93, 122, 148, 162, 197, 233.

*Genuine Grub-Street Opera*, i, 111, iii, 293; see also *Grub-Street Opera*.

GEORGE II, in the allegory of *The Welsh Opera*, 106-7; patronizes Handel, i, 146, 153; attends a performance of *The London Merchant*, i, 199; satirized in the print of *The Golden Rump*, and probably in the play of the same name, i, 226-7; Patriots side with Prince of Wales against, i, 179; reconciliation with the Prince, i, 194; his dislike of Pitt, ii, 13; his opinion of Winnington, ii, 72; praised in *Ovid's Art of Love Paraphrased*, ii, 54, and in *Penlez*, ii, 238;

# INDEX

Fielding's loyalty to, ii, 14, 20, 37, 98.

*Geraubte Einsiedlerinn*, iii, 349.

GERMAN, Edward, iii, 358.

GEROULD, Gordon Hall, iii, 334.

*Geschichte des Ritters von Kilpar*, iii, 349.

GEVAERT, F. A., iii, 353.

GIBBON, Edward, references to Fielding, i, 1-2, iii, 168.

GIBBS, James, ii, 379.

GIBSON, Thomas, ii, 273.

GIFFARD, Henry, brings out Fielding's *Temple Beau*, i, 76, 78; buys Booth's share in Drury Lane, i, 148, 156; removes to Lincoln's Inn Fields, i, 177-8; produces *Pasquin* there, i, 217; *The Golden Rump*, i, 227-8, 232; effect of the Licensing Act, i, 232.

GILFILLAN, George, iii, 227.

GILLIVER, Lawton, i, 250.

GIRARD, Father, i, 126.

GLENNEY, Charles, iii, 358.

GLOVER, Richard, i, 271, 399.

GODDEN, Miss G. M., discovers Colonel Fielding's *Bill of Complaint*, i, 24; discovers official letters of Fielding and documents in Lady Gould's Chancery case, i, 30 n, iii, 249; letter from the Rev. George Miller about *Tom Jones*, ii, 113; attributes to Fielding *A Speech made in the Censorial Court*, iii, 347; her *Life of Fielding*, i, 254, iii, 85, 359-64.

GODOLPHIN, Francis, 2d Earl, ii, 72.

GODSCHALL, Sir Robert, i, 395.

GODWIN, William, iii, 164-5, 167, 169, 206.

GOETHE, says German novels come from Fielding, iii, 194.

*Golden Rump*, i, 226-8, results in the Licensing Act, i, 228-32; not by Fielding, i, 227-8, iii, 341; *Vision of the Golden Rump*, i, 226, 266.

GOLDSMITH, Oliver, employs the title *The Good-Natur'd Man*, iii, 104; sees *The Miser*, and *The Mock Doctor*, iii, 153; *The Vicar of Wakefield* and *Joseph Andrews*, iii, 161; Goethe on, iii, 194; Stephen compares him with Fielding, iii, 241; mentioned, ii, 355, 418.

*Good Nature*, i, 250, 384.

*Good-Natur'd Man*, see *Fathers, The*.

GOSSE, Edmund, iii, 253, 333.

GOULD, Davidge (Fielding's uncle), i, 15, 20, 31-5, 37-8, 51, 239, 258-9, iii, 359-60.

GOULD, Sir Henry (Fielding's grandfather), leaves trust fund for his daughter, i, 15-6, 19, 30, 37; purchases farm at East Stour for her, i, 19-20, 30-2; distrusts Col. Edmund Fielding, i, 15; his seat at Sharpham, i, 16-9; Fielding probably born there, passes infancy there, i, 16-9, ii, 360; death, i, 20; mentioned, ii, 240.

GOULD, Henry (Fielding's cousin), i, 242, ii, 2, 47, 65.

GOULD, Katherine, i, 15, 17 n.

GOULD, Mary, i, 362.

GOULD, Lady Sarah (Davidge), marriage and children, i, 15; lived with the Fieldings, i, 20-1, 24; anger at Colonel Fielding's second marriage, i, 27; Edmund consigned to her care, i, 29; *Bill of Complaint* against Colonel Fielding, i, 30-9; at Salisbury, i, 247; Henry visits her there, i, 35-6, iii, 269; death, i, 163; mentioned, i, 51, 53, 56, 165.

GRAFTON, Duke of, i, 370, iii, 328.

GRAFTON, Thomas, i, 26.

GRAHAM, James, i, 261, iii, 302.

GRANT, William, iii, 121.

GRAVELOT (H. F. Bourguignon), i, 257, ii, 140.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

GRAVES, Rev. Richard, ii, 110, iii, 112.

GRAY, Thomas, opinion of *Joseph Andrews*, i, 358-9, his *Elegy*, ii, 268; imitated, ii, 381; Walpole on message cards, iii, 344; mentioned, iii, 163.

*Gray's-Inn Journal*, ii, 372, 424.

GREEN, Emanuel, iii, 247, 354.

GREEN, Thomas, iii, 172.

GREENE, Robert, iii, 232.

GRIFFITHS, Ralph, ii, 132, 309, 406.

*Grub-street Journal*, *The*, Fielding's quarrel with, i, 114-41, 276, 365; suspends attack, i, 160; protests against scandalous treatment of him, i, 161; praises his unmasking of corrupt politicians, i, 189; its character, iii, 262; verses on Pope, i, 196; on *The Covent-Garden Tragedy*, i, 127-30, 132-4, 140; on *The Grub-Street Opera*, i, 110; on *The Miser*, i, 145; on *The Mock Doctor*, i, 130-2, 135, 139; on *The Modern Husband*, i, 95, 119-25, 134, 140; on *The Old Debauchees*, i, 125-7, 129-32, 134, 136, 140; on *A Rehearsal of Kings*, i, 207-8; on *Tom Thumb*, i, 112-3, 134; mentioned, i, 260.

*Grub-Street Opera*, a rewriting of *The Welsh Opera*, *q. v.*; described, i, 108-10, 408; performance deferred, i, 110-2; published, i, 111; Fielding takes song from, i, 131; see also *Genuine Grub-Street Opera*; bibliography, iii, 293, 328.

GUALTERUS, Petrus, i, 176, 348, ii, 391, iii, 308; *see also* Walter, Peter.

GULLIVER, Lemuel, pseudonym of Fielding, i, 60, iii, 289.

GURNELL, Thomas, ii, 290 *n.*

HAINES, John, ii, 238.

HALSTEAD, Henry, i, 35.

HAMILTON, Charles, ii, 245.

HAMILTON, Jenny, ii, 245, 247.

HAMMOND, James, i, 390.

HANDEL, George F., i, 59, 146, 153, 178.

HAPSBURGS, The, i, 1-4.

HARDINGE, George, i, 244-5.

HARDWICKE, 1st Earl of, Lord Chancellor, ii, 13, 37, 113, 173, 243, 255, 279, iii, 13, 280, 362, 364.

HARLEY, Robert, Earl of Oxford, *see* Oxford.

HARPER, John, i, 63, 149.

HARRINGTON, Dr., of Bath, ii, 174.

HARRINGTON, James, ii, 58.

HARRINGTON, William Stanhope, 1st Earl of, i, 56-7, ii, 138.

HARRIS, George, ii, 113.

HARRIS, James, friendship with Fielding, i, 247; *Enquiry into Happiness*, i, 387; gives bail for Arthur Collier, ii, 43-4; *Much Ado, and Fashion*, ii, 47; contributor to *Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 374; abstract of *Hermes*, ii, 379; Austin Dobson on, ii, 384 *n.*; annotates Sarah Fielding's *Memoirs of Socrates*, iii, 113; on Fielding's character, iii, 151, 258, 266.

HATCHETT, William, i, 107-8, 146-7, iii, 351.

HAVARD, William, ii, 416.

*Have at You All*, *see* *Drury-Lane Journal*.

HAVERKAMP, Sigbertus, i, 67.

HAWKES, William, i, 316.

HAWKESWORTH, John, ii, 424, 426, iii, 347.

HAWKINS, Capt. John, i, 241.

HAWKINS, Sir John, iii, 162, 167, 169, 171.

HAWKINS, William, iii, 80, 365.

HAYES, John, i, 384.

HAYTER, Thomas, i, 240, iii, 360.

HAYWOOD, Mrs., of Covent Garden, i, 129, 369.

# INDEX

HAYWOOD, Mrs. Eliza, her inane stories attacked by Pope, i, 84; assists in turning *Tragedy of Tragedies* into opera, i, 146-7, ii, 415, iii, 350-1, for which Arne writes music, i, 42, 146, iii, 154, and Lampe, i, 147 n, iii, 351; in *A Rehearsal of Kings*, i, 208; may have written *Sir Peevy Pet*, i, 209, iii, 336, and *The Female Free Mason*, i, 217; *The Fortunate Foundlings*, ii, 218; *Miss Betsy Thoughtless*, ii, 414-5, iii, 180, 346.

HAZLITT, William, on Fielding's novels, iii, 161, 205-6; quoted, iii, 136-7.

HEATHCOTE, Sir Gilbert, i, 59.

HEDERICUS, Benjamin, i, 346, iii, 80-2, 340, 363.

HEDLEV, Mrs., iii, 60.

HEIDEGGER, John James, i, 59-61, 111, ii, 352.

HELE, Richard, ii, 168, 170, iii, 11.

HENDERSON, Matthew, criminal, ii, 41.

HENLEY, John, "Orator," i, 84-5, 112, 171, ii, 23, 409.

HENLEY, Robert, Earl of Northington, i, 245, 378, ii, 2.

HENLEY, W. E., on Fielding, iii, 253-9, 262, 267, 269, 271, 274; edition of Fielding's Works, iii, 125 n, 130, 333-4.

HERMES, Johann T., iii, 193.

HERRING, Archbishop, ii, 14.

HERTFORD, Lady, Duchess of Somerset, ii, 116-8, 223, 268.

HERVEY, Augustus John, iii, 118.

HERVEY, John, Lord, i, 104, 106-7, 182, 215, 219, 230, 306, 310, 423.

HEUFELD, Franz von, iii, 353.

Hickathrift, see, *History of Thomas Hickathrift*.

HIGHMORE, John, i, 148-9, 155.

HILL, Aaron, editor of the *Prompter*, i, 171, 191-2, 195, 252; his *Fatal*

*Extravagance*, i, 202; reads *Pamela* aloud, i, 302-3; writes to Richardson, ii, 145, 148.

HILL, Astraea and Minerva, their opinion of *Tom Jones*, ii, 145-7, 161.

HILL, Dr. John, sketch of him, ii, 389-91; writer for *The London Daily Advertiser*, ii, 359; newspaper war with Fielding, ii, 391-6, 398, 401, 416, 419, 422, 429, iii, 157, 279; *The Inspector in the Shades*, iii, 347; on *Tom Jones*, ii, 132; on Elizabeth Canning, ii, 294-7; on *Amelia*, ii, 348; in Kenrick's *Fun*, ii, 407-9; Mountefort Brown assaults him, ii, 419-21; Woodward's letter to, ii, 425-6, iii, 348; admired Fielding's novels, iii, 157; mentioned, ii, 413, 424.

HILL, M. Davenport, iii, 228-30.

HILLHOUSE, James T., iii, 292, 335.

HIPPISLEY, John, i, 97.

*Historical Register for 1736*, described, i, 210-6; performed, i, 209, 218, 220, iii, 146; extended into *Eurydice Hiss'd*, i, 216; published, i, 222; the preface to it, i, 222-4, 238; Colley Cibber in, i, 272; Sir Robert Walpole in, i, 228, 408; mentioned, i, 415; bibliography, iii, 301, 311, 328.

*History of a Foundling*, see *Tom Jones*.

*History of Charles XII*, see Adlerfeld.

*History of Joseph Andrews*, see *Joseph Andrews*.

*History of Pompey the Little*, see Coventry, Francis.

*History of Sir Harry Herald*, iii, 170, 348.

*History of the present Rebellion*, ii, 56 n, iii, 310.

*History of Thomas Hickathrift*, iii, 340-1.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

*History of Tom Jones*, see *Tom Jones*.

HOADLY, Benjamin (Bishop), i, 112, 289, 382, ii, 20, 173, 331, iii, 239, 266.

HOADLY, Benjamin (son of Bishop), i, 112, iii, 154.

HOADLY, John (son of Bishop), i, 112, iii, 114.

HOBSES, John Oliver (Mrs. Craigie), iii, 175.

HOBSES, Thomas, i, 390.

HODGES, J., i, 285, iii, 337.

HOEY, James, ii, 386, iii, 316, 323-4, 348.

HOGARTH, William, friendship with Fielding, i, 101, iii, 266; Fielding's estimate of, i, 65; his art compared with Fielding's, i, 323, 359, ii, 176, iii, 270, 276; print of Heidegger, i, 60, of Misaubin, i, 131, of Dr. Ward, iii, 14; ticket for Laguerre, i, 171, and for Roberts, i, 196, 197 n; frontispiece for *Tom Thumb*, i, 101, and for Molière's *Works*, i, 144; woodcut for *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 67-9, 76; *Gin Lane*, ii, 268; the *Terrible Leo*, ii, 391; portrait of Fielding, iii, 70-4, 127, 135, 328; *Le Portrait de Fielding*, iii, 184-5; in *Amelia*, ii, 354; in *Tom Jones*, ii, 175, 387, iii, 191; mentioned, iii, 191, 236.

HOLCROFT, Thomas, iii, 356.

HOOKE, Nathaniel, i, 360-1, ii, 174.

HOOPER, William, ii, 167.

HOPWOOD, James, iii, 74.

HORSLY, W., a writer known as "The Fool," in *The Daily Gazetteer*, ii, 63.

HOWARD, Alfred, iii, 331.

HOWARD, Mary, i, 27-8.

HOWELLS, W. D., iii, 175.

HUGGONSON, J., i, 250, 261, 297, iii, 304, 338.

HULETT, James, i, 356.

HUNTER, Dr. William, iii, 26, 40-1, 44, 106, 164, 168.

HURD, Richard, ii, 127, 310, 312, iii, 4, 137.

HUSBAND, Jane, i, 378-9.

HUSSEY, Mrs., ii, 104-5, 172, iii, 266.

HUTH, Alfred, iii, 360-2.

*Hymn to the Mob*, see Defoe.

*Hyp Doctor*, i, 112.

*Important Triflers*, ii, 136-8, iii, 316.

*Increase of Robbers*, see *Enquiry*.

*Inspector in the Shades*, iii, 347.

*Interlude between Jupiter, Juno, Apollo . . .*, i, 385-6, 394, iii, 329.

*Intriguing Chambermaid*, described, i, 154; performed, i, 149-53, 155, iii, 154; dedicated to Mrs. Clive, i, 154-5, 159, ii, 366, iii, 219; Charlotte Fielding in, i, 167; mentioned, i, 161; bibliography, iii, 297-8, 311, 328.

IRELAND, John, iii, 72.

*Jacobite's Journal*, begun by Fielding as John Trottplaid, Esq., ii, 64; his contributions, ii, 92; general description, ii, 64-5; its irony and humour, ii, 66-7, 69-72, 77-8, 138; frontispiece by Hogarth, ii, 67-9, 76-7; political warfare in, ii, 77-9, 80-2; clash with Horace Walpole, ii, 79-80; abuse of Fielding, ii, 82-5; Court of Criticism, ii, 85-92, 342, 413; attack on Carte, ii, 87; on Foote, ii, 88-90; praise of *Clarissa Harlowe*, ii, 90, 141; relation to *Tom Jones*, ii, 101-2, 106-8, 111, iii, 274; Scott on, iii, 209; Lawrence on, iii, 233; mentioned, ii, 52, 358, 364, 371, 386-7, 388; iii, 40, 131, 336; bibliography, iii, 127, 129, 315-6, 329.

JAMES, Dr. Robert, ii, 355-6, 361.

# INDEX

JEACOCKE, Caleb, ii, 417.

JENSEN, Dr. Gerard E., on Bonnell Thornton, ii, 402; on Kenrick's *Fun*, ii, 409; edits *The Covent-Garden Journal*, iii, 323, 335; publishes all leading articles in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, iii, 131; on Fielding as editor, iii, 249; quoted, iii, 347-8.

JESSE, J. Heneage, iii, 239, 364.

JOHN OF BRAGANZA, iii, 66-7.

JOHNES, Thomas, iii, 101.

JOHNSON, Charles, *Caelia*, i, 143, iii, 296, 334, 336.

JOHNSON, Dr. Samuel, reviews the Duchess of Marlborough's *Account*, i, 360-1; introduces Garrick to Cave, i, 371; estimates of Richardson and Fielding, ii, 130, iii, 157-63, 167; his *Irene*, ii, 130; on the reviewing of books, ii, 132, iii, 188; on *Amelia*, ii, 304-5, 338, 347; said to have fabricated parliamentary speeches, i, 371, ii, 353; estimate of Thornton, ii, 400, of James Harris, iii, 151; holds Hill up to scorn, ii, 421; his library compared with Fielding's, iii, 76-7; Murphy flatters him, iii, 127; Mudford's *Critical Enquiry*, iii, 201-3; mentioned, ii, 8, 47, 390, 414, 424.

JOHNSON, Samuel (dancing-master), i, 79-80.

JOHNSTONE, Mrs. Eliza, iii, 358.

Jonathan Wild, date of writing, i, 409-12; described, i, 403-4, 424-5; its purpose, i, 277, 412-4; political significance, i, 417-25; its irony, i, 280; characters in, i, 415-6; analogy between careers of Walpole and Wild, i, 410, 417, 420-2, iii, 283; revised, i, 411, 423-4; revised edition published, iii, 9-10; estimate by Aikin, iii, 196, by Coleridge, ii, 425, by Keightley, iii, 238, by Scott, iii, 211, by Wells, iii, 249; Taine's acquaintance with, iii, 188; in sale of

Fielding's library, iii, 80, 83; mentioned, ii, 7, 52, 269, iii, 12, 61, 63, 166, 243, 264, 274, 281; bibliography, iii, 179, 320, 325-6, 328, 333, 340.

JONSON, Ben, i, 107, 112, 140-1, 197, ii, 365, 434, iii, 78.

Joseph Andrews, date of writing, i, 396; Fielding discovers himself in, i, 409, ii, 99; described, i, 316-31; its scene, ii, 179; its characters, i, 22-4, 41, 45, 47, 49, 168, 176, 241, 307-9, 315, 324-31, 342-50, 377, 392, 396, 410, ii, 2, 159-60, 372, 434, iii, 11, 105, 126, 156, 161, 174, 188; its humour, i, 331-44, 396, ii, 2-3, 95, 378, 434-7; its relation to *Don Quixote*, i, 322-4, 394-5, ii, 136, 205, 414, iii, 11, to *Pamela*, i, 314-5, 320, iii, 283, to *Shamela*, i, 307, to *Tom Jones*, ii, 437, to *Amelia*, ii, 353, 437, to *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 60, to *The Vicar of Wakefield*, iii, 161, to *The Upholsterer*, iii, 126, to *The Rivals*, iii, 156; published by Millar, i, 286, 315-6; its format, ii, 7; the 2d edition, i, 352-5; the 3d and 4th editions, i, 355, 381; other editions and translations, i, 355-7, ii, 64, 92, iii, 178-81, 190-2, 199; its reception, i, 357-9, ii, 136; Cibber ridiculed in, iii, 282; Marivaux imitated in, i, 321-2; no copy in Fielding's library, iii, 79; not read by Dr. Johnson, iii, 158; Charles Edward Stuart asks for it, ii, 36; Fielding's own estimate of it, ii, 45-6; the estimate of Coleridge, iii, 176, of Mrs. Delany, ii, 310, of Gilfillan, iii, 227, of Harris, iii, 152, of Sir John Hawkins, iii, 163, of Lady Hertford, ii, 116, of Dr. Hill, iii, 157, of La Harpe, iii, 187, of Lady Luxborough, ii, 127-8, of Macaulay, iii, 174, of Lady Mary Montagu, ii, 128, of Hannah

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

More, iii, 159, of Dr. John Moore, iii, 164, of Tom Moore, iii, 204-5, of Murphy, iii, 123, of Scott, iii, 166, 211, of Shenstone, ii, 127, of Southey, iii, 205, of Taine, iii, 188-9, of Thackeray, iii, 175, 213-4, 220; mentioned, i, 22, 310, 379, 411, ii, 61, 428-9, iii, 167-8, 206, 227; bibliography, iii, 305-6, 328, 331, 361.

*Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*, see *Voyage*.

*Journey from this World to the Next*, date of composition, i, 395-6, 410; the first draft, i, 280; a modernization of Lucian, i, 394-5, 404; described, i, 396-403; its irony compared with that of Swift, i, 404; Allen and Pope complimented in, i, 383; Fielding on the influence of satire, iii, 278; Fielding's realism in, iii, 136, 262-3; the Palace of Death in, ii, 164; translations of, iii, 179-80; Dickens reads it, iii, 229; Tom Moore's estimate, iii, 205; Scott's estimate of, iii, 166; tagged by an anonymous Lucianic vision, ii, 4; mentioned, i, 411; bibliography, iii, 309, 327-8, 343.

*Jupiter's Descent on Earth*, i, 386.

KEIGHTLEY, Thomas, ii, 165, 179, 194, 197, iii, 236-8, 246-9.

KENNEDY, Dr. John, ii, 304, 348, 351.

KENRICK, William, ii, 4-5, 387-8, 407, 409-10, 429, iii, 154, 351, 354.

KEYBER, see *Shamela*.

Kilpar, *Mémoires du Chevalier de*, see *Gain de Montagnac*.

KING, Joseph, i, 376-7.

KING, Thomas, iii, 104-5.

KING, Mr., of Bath, ii, 174.

KIPPIS, Dr. Andrew, iii, 148, 204.

KLOPSTOCK, F. G., iii, 191, 194.

KNOX, Vicesimus, iii, 169.

LACY, James, i, 131, 187, 208, 233, ii, 393, 413.

LAGUERRE, John, i, 171.

LA HARPE, J. F. de, iii, 187.

LAKE, Eliza, iii, 349-50.

LAMB, Charles, iii, 105, 206, 223.

LAMBARDE, William, ii, 231.

LAMPE, John Frederick, i, 147 n, iii, 351.

LANE, Thomas, ii, 11, 253, iii, 13.

LANG, Andrew, iii, 253.

LA PLACE, Pierre-Antoine de, ii, 139-40, iii, 179, 181, 183-4, 190, 197.

*Law of the Land*, iii, 357.

LAWRENCE, Frederick, his *Henry Fielding*, iii, 232-8; his List of Fielding's Works, iii, 125 n; quoted or cited, iii, 340, 343, 346, 348, 359, 362, 366.

LEBECK, cook, original of Fielding's *Heliogabalus*, ii, 105.

LEE, Sir John, i, 10.

LEE, Melville, ii, 241.

LEE, Nathaniel, i, 86, 100.

LEE, Sir William, i, 289.

LEEDS, Serjeant, ii, 11.

LEIGH, R. A. Austen, iii, 86.

LENNOX, Charlotte, ii, 414, iii, 16.

LESSING, G. E., iii, 193-4.

*Letter to a Noble Lord*, i, 370, iii, 343.

*Letter-Writers*, performed and published, i, 98; playbill, i, 99; described, i, 102; not popular, i, 104; bibliography, iii, 292, 311, 328.

*Letters and manuscripts of Fielding*, iii, 358-64.

LEVERANCE, Giles, iii, 40.

LEVERIDGE, Richard, i, 109.

LEWIS, Joseph, i, 50-1.

LEWIS, Mrs. Mary, iii, 71, 73.

LEWIS, Matthew G., iii, 172.

*Liberty*, i, 384.

LIBRARY, Fielding's, iii, 75-83.

LICHTENBERG, G. C., iii, 194.

# INDEX

*Life and Adventures of a Cat*, iii, 348.

*Life and Death of Common-Sense*, iii, 355.

*Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild*, see *Jonathan Wild*.

LILLO, George, i, 199-202, 217, 256, ii, 245, iii, 266, 300.

LINDNER, Felix, iii, 333.

LLOYD, Sir Richard, ii, 268, 279-80.

LLOYD, William, i, 12-3.

LOBBAN, J. H., iii, 327.

LOCKE, John, ii, 271, 430, iii, 79.

LOCKER-LAMPSON, Frederick, iii, 153, 364.

*London Daily Advertiser* (or *The Daily Advertiser*), ii, 22, 23, 294, 357, 359, 361, 377, 389-90, 392, 395, 402, 404, 420.

*London Daily Post*, i, 197, ii, 79; also cited in footnotes and bibliography.

*London Evening Post*, ii, 38, 63, 67, 80, 83, 86, 92.

*London Magazine*, i, 166, 409, ii, 35, 52, 106, 129, 137, 157, 224, 266, 278, 296, 309, 336, iii, 93.

*Lottery, The*, performed, i, 117, ii, 50; published, iii, 294; described, i, 116-7; bibliography, iii, 293-4, 311, 328.

LOUNSBURY, T. R., iii, 130, 252.

*Love and Revenge*, i, 78.

*Love in Several Masques*, described, i, 54-5, 58, 62-5, 77; its preparation for the stage, i, 53; Lady Mary Montagu reads it and sees it performed, i, 58, 118; produced, i, 61-2, 65; Mrs. Oldfield in, iii, 219; published, i, 62 n, its relation to *The Universal Gallant*, i, 172; compared with *Don Quixote in England*, i, 70-1; bibliography, iii, 290, 311, 328.

*Lover's Assistant*, ii, 52-4, iii, 313.

LOWE, Solomon, ii, 149-50.

LOWELL, James Russell, Fielding's "artless inadvertence," iii, 92; advises Harriet Beecher Stowe to read *Tom Jones*, iii, 230; his address on Fielding, iii, 251-5.

*Loyal Song*, ii, 21, 31.

LUCIAN, *Dialogues of the Dead* modernized, i, 394; Fielding's proposed translation of, iii, 324.

LUN, John, see Rich, John.

LUXBOROUGH, Lady, friend of the Rev. Richard Graves, ii, 110, and of the Rev. John Dalton, ii, 223; reads *Tom Jones*, ii, 117, 161; prefers *Joseph Andrews* to it, ii, 127; ascribes *Pompey the Little* to Fielding, ii, 172, 304, iii, 346; mentioned, ii, 116, 268.

LYSONS, Daniel, ii, 234.

LYTTELTON, George, Lord, Fielding's intimacy with, i, 42, 179, 290, ii, 62, 95, 115, iii, 134, 266; with Chesterfield establishes *Common Sense*, i, 218; Fielding's relation to it, i, 239; praised by Fielding, i, 250, 412, ii, 20, 90; contributes to *The Champion*, i, 254; in *True Greatness*, i, 289; his party aided by the Duchess of Marlborough, i, 362; subscribes for the *Miscellanies*, i, 382; Fielding addresses *Liberty* to, i, 384; becomes Lord of the Treasury, ii, 13; resembled Charles Edward, ii, 37; Fielding admires his *Persian Letters*, ii, 48; Fielding writes a letter in the manner of, ii, 49; on Fielding's paraphrase of Ovid, ii, 53; in *Peregrine Pickle*, ii, 61-2; relation to *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 63; which defends him, ii, 79-80; *A Letter to the Tories* ascribed to, ii, 80; pelted in verse and prose, ii, 82-3; recommends Fielding as a Justice, ii, 96, 227; *Tom Jones* dedicated to, ii, 99, iii, 317, 329; aids Fielding, ii, 100,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

126, iii, 211, 272; guest of Sanderson Miller, ii, 112-3, 116; sees *Tom Jones* in manuscript, ii, 114, 180, 216; arouses curiosity about *Tom Jones*, ii, 118, 129; no mention of *Tom Jones* in his writings, ii, 127; advises Richardson about *Clarissa*, ii, 142; Allworthy as a portrait of, ii, 162; Fielding's letter about Moore, ii, 244-7, iii, 362; on a committee to revise the laws relating to felony, ii, 268; gives charity to a baker, ii, 303; probably not a contributor to *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 385; as Littlebones in *Old England*, ii, 388; sees no dramatic merit in *The Regicide*, ii, 397; pilloried by Smollett, ii, 398; quoted by Murphy, iii, 135; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 151, 167-8; his *Dialogues of the Dead*, ii, 127, iii, 160; mentioned, i, 270, ii, 129, 179, iii, 236.

LYTTON, E. Bulwer, Lord, iii, 230.

MACAULAY, Thomas Babington, defence of Fielding, iii, 173-5.

MACCLESFIELD, Lord, i, 38-9.

MACDANIEL, informer, iii, 245-6.

MACKLIN, Charles, employed in trifling parts, i, 92, 148; in *The Author's Farce*, i, 150; in *Don Quixote in England*, i, 157; in *Euridice*, i, 206; in *The Wedding Day*, i, 358, 374-5, ii, 411, iii, 143-4; in *The Virgin Unmask'd*, i, 369; in *Miss Lucy*, i, 369; Foote mimics him, ii, 89; his *Pasquin turn'd Draw-cansir*, ii, 410-14, iii, 351-2; in *The Coffee-House Politician*, ii, 410; rivalry with Garrick, ii, 411; a member of the Robinhood Society, ii, 417, 419; mentioned, i, 61.

MACKLIN, Mrs., i, 369, 374.

MADDOX, Isaac, Bishop of Worcester, ii, 255, 257, 269, 366, iii, 266, 324.

MADDOX, acrobat, ii, 423.  
*Malheurs du Sentiment*, iii, 349.

MALLET, David, iii, 17.  
*Man of Taste*, see Miller, James.

MANN, Horace, i, 369.  
*MANSFIELD*, Lord, see Murray, William.

*Manuscripts*, Fielding's, iii, 358-66; see also Library.

MARCHMONT, Countess of, ii, 184, iii, 345.

*Marforio*, i, 191-2; see also Rich, John.

MARIE Antoinette, her copies of Fielding's novels, iii, 179.

MARIVAUX, P. C. de, i, 321-2, ii, 433, iii, 135 n, 160, 169.

MARLBOROUGH, Charles, Duke of, i, 172, 382, iii, 299.

MARLBOROUGH, John, Duke of, i, 362, 397, 414, ii, 72, 258.

MARLBOROUGH, Sarah Jennings, Duchess of, i, 316, 360-2, ii, 174, iii, 307, 384, 361.

MARLOWE, Christopher, i, 62, iii, 232.

MARTIN, Colonel, ii, 38-9.

MARTYN, Benjamin, i, 161.

MASON, William, ii, 375, 381, 432.

*Masquerade, The*, i, 53, 60-1, 111, 293, iii, 289-90, 350.

MATHIAS, Thomas James, iii, 172.

MAUDE, Mr. and Mrs. Cyril, iii, 358.

MAZARINE, Duchess of, ii, 170.

MEAD, Dr. Richard, i, 145, iii, 76.

*Mémoires du Chevalier de Kilpar*, see Gain de Montagnac.

MENNECHET, Edouard, iii, 185-6, 357.

MERCIER, Louis S., iii, 349.

METHUEN, Sir Paul, iii, 82.

MEYRIONET, Chevalier de Saint-Marc de, iii, 66-7.

MIDDLESEX, Earl of, iii, 3.

# INDEX

MIDDLETON, Dr. Conyers, i, 306-7, 310.

MIDFORD, Robert and Barbara, i, 24-6, 39.

MILDmay, Carew Hervey, ii, 166-7.

MILLAR, Andrew, publishes *History of Charles XII*, i, 285, iii, 337, *Joseph Andrews*, i, 315-6, 352-6, ii, 119, iii, 305-6, 361, *Miss Lucy in Town*, i, 316, 368, iii, 307, 361, *The Wedding Day*, i, 374, iii, 308, *Miscellanies*, i, 380-1, iii, 398-9, *Ovid's Art of Love Paraphrased*, ii, 52, iii, 313, *Tom Jones*, ii, 108, 117-23, 125, 160, 226, 307, iii, 317, 361-2, *Amelia*, ii, 304-8, 312, iii, 9, 321, *Jonathan Wild*, iii, 9, 325-6, *Charge to the Grand Jury*, iii, 319, *True State of Penlez*, iii, 319-20, *Enquiry into the Causes of Robberies*, iii, 320-1, *Interposition of Providence*, iii, 324, *Provision for the Poor*, iii, 325, *Case of Elizabeth Canning*, iii, 425, *Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 84-8, 326-7, Murphy's edition of Fielding's Works, ii, 306, iii, 71, 73, 127, 134, 328, Sarah Fielding's *David Simple*, ii, 7-8, iii, 309, 328-9, *Familiar Letters*, ii, 46, iii, 314, *Cleopatra and Octavia*, ii, 52; other books published by, ii, 38, 106, 379, 414; *Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough*, assigned to Millar with *Miss Lucy* and *Joseph Andrews* but not published by him, i, 316, iii, 307, 361; Fielding sends him cider, iii, 40-1, and onions, iii, 57; his legacies to Fielding's children, iii, 117; mentioned, i, 404, ii, 18, 42, 392-3, iii, 10, 56, 310-2.

MILLER, Rev. George, ii, 113.

MILLER, James, i, 173 n, iii, 336, 341.

MILLER, Philip, ii, 53, 174.

MILLER, Sanderson, ii, 112-4, 116, 164, 173, 180, iii, 266.

MILLS, John, i, 63, 142, ii, 416.

MILTON, John, i, 292, 399, 401, ii, 19, 131, 251, 365, iii, 79, 178.

MISAUBIN, Dr. John, i, 131-2, iii, 14, 244, 296.

MISAVAN, John, ii, 156-7.

*Miscellanies*, proposals for printing, i, 380; the subscribers to, i, 244, 363, 381-3, ii, 42, 47, 266; published, i, 381; described, i, 383-425; on Fielding's poems in, ii, 379, iii, 153, 218; author's preface, i, 383, iii, 128, 136, 144, 213; preface and poems reprinted by Browne, iii, 129; in Fielding's library, iii, 80, 83; mentioned, i, 165, 207, 257, 298, 351, 368, 375, ii, 1-2, 4, 46, 99, iii, 9-10, 103, 196; bibliography, iii, 308-9, 332, 342; see also *Jonathan Wild* and *Journey from this World*.

*Miser*, described, i, 144-6; performed, i, 143, 146, 337-8, 369, ii, 50, iii, 153, 233-4; dedicated to the Duke of Richmond, i, 143, 250; Goldsmith sees it, iii, 153; praised in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, i, 145; mentioned, iii, 103, 235; bibliography, iii, 297, 311, 328.

*Miss Lucy in Town*, described, i, 368, ii, 202; performed, i, 369-70, 374; published, i, 316, 369; bibliography, iii, 307, 328, 343, 361.

*Mist's Weekly Journal*, i, 89, 409.

MITCHELL, Sir Andrew, ii, 305-7, 309.

*Mock Doctor*, written, i, 125; described, i, 130-2, 145; rehearsed, i, 130; performed, i, 131, 202, 217, 371, iii, 106, 153; Goldsmith sees it, iii, 153; Garrick composes an Epilogue for it, i, 371; Fielding compliments the Cibbers in the preface, i, 115; dedicated to Dr. Misaubin, iii, 244; attacked by *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 185; Fielding's

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

reply, i, 139; mentioned, i, 144; bibliography, iii, 296, 311, 328.

*Modern Husband*, announced, i, 95; circulates in manuscript, i, 118, iii, 144; submitted to Lady Mary Montagu, i, 118; performed, i, 119-21; described, i, 119-21, 171; its reception, i, 121-5, 129, 365, ii, 325; published, i, 121, 140; Fielding mockingly condemns it, i, 134; drawn upon for *Amelia*, ii, 325, 335, 351, iii, 278; bibliography, iii, 294, 311, 328, 359.

*Modish Couple*, i, 118, iii, 294.

MOLIÈRE, Fielding reads him, i, 63, iii, 78; and praises him, ii, 433; Barthe compares him with Fielding, iii, 187; wrote a farce in three days, iii, 273; English translation of his Comedies, i, 144, iii, 335-6; his *Tartuffe* and Fielding's *Old Debauchees*, i, 126; his *Médecin malgré lui* and Fielding's *Mock Doctor*, i, 130-2, 135, 189, 144-5, 154, iii, 296; his *L'Avare* and Fielding's *Miser*, i, 144-5, 154, 338, iii, 297; his *Mariage Forcé* and Garrick's *Irish Widow*, iii, 106; his *Precieuses Ridicules* and Miller's *Man of Taste*, iii, 341; mentioned, i, 137.

MOLLOY, Charles, i, 239.

MONBODDO, Lord, iii, 168.

MONTAGNAC, *see* Gain de Montagnac.

MONTAGU, Elizabeth, ii, 127, iii, 160-1.

MONTAGU, George, ii, 227.

MONTAGU, Lady Mary Wortley, Fielding's cousin, i, 58; captivated by Fielding, i, 58; befriends him, i, 58, 74, iii, 244; reads *Love in Several Masques*, i, 58, 118; Fielding dedicates it to her, i, 62, iii, 290; reads *Modern Husband*, i, 118-21; Fielding's letters to, i, 118-9, iii, 359; Molière's Comedies dedicated to, i,

144; reads *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, i, 358, ii, 128-9; letter about Charles Edward, ii, 36-7; subscribes for *Familiar Letters*, ii, 47; Fielding praises her, ii, 48; on the character of Fielding, ii, 61, 328, iii, 109-10, 237, 254; on Fielding's second wife, iii, 137; guessed *Roderick Random* was by Fielding, ii, 303-4, iii, 345; thought *A Voyage to Lisbon* trivial, iii, 93-4; mentioned, ii, 11, iii, 198, 215, 268.

MONTAIGNE, i, 389, ii, 226, iii, 78.

MONTFORT, Lord, ii, 289.

*Monthly Review*, ii, 132, 184, 281, 267, 309, 406, iii, 85, 93, 98, 153, 348.

MONTRESOR, Colonel James Gabriel, iii, 119-21.

MOORE, Edward, Fielding praises his *Selim*, ii, 90, 244, and *The Foundling*, ii, 90; *The Foundling* performed, ii, 107, 218; recommends him to Lyttelton, ii, 244-7; his intimacy with Fielding, ii, 302, iii, 4, 137, 265.

MOORE, Dr. John, iii, 163-4.

MOORE, Thomas, iii, 204.

MORE, Hannah, iii, 159-60, 172.

MORGAN, J. Pierpont, iii, 179, 361-

2.

MORGAN, Macnamara, ii, 4-5, 154, 387, iii, 343.

MORRISON, Alfred, iii, 365.

MOSSOP, Henry, ii, 415-6.

MOUNTFORT, William, i, 107.

MUDFORD, William, iii, 74, 201-4, 228.

MULSO, Hester, ii, 347.

MURPHY, Arthur, as an editor, iii, 126-8, 131; as a biographer, iii, 131; his edition of the Works of Fielding, ii, 306, iii, 71, 125, 127-31, 196, 328, 330, 332; his life of Fielding, iii, 132-50, 151-3, 188, 195-9, 203, 209, 220, 233-4, 239, 242, 249-50, 254, 259-

# INDEX

60, 266, 269; Fielding's birthplace, i, 16; Fielding's early education, i, 22; Fielding at Eton, i, 42, and at Leyden, i, 66, 72; Fielding's dissipation, i, 57, 175, 244, iii, 237-9; Fielding reads Cicero, i, 46; Fielding's interest in Crown law, i, 246, iii, 83, 366; Fielding's attention to his legal duties, ii, 1; Fielding's essays in *The Champion*, i, 254; Fielding's political tracts, i, 282; Parson Trulliber, i, 308; *The Wedding Day*, i, 374; *Journey from this World*, i, 403; *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 85, 88; *Comment on Bolingbroke*, iii, 18-9; Mrs. Fielding's fortune, i, 174; her illness and death, ii, 10-11; Fielding's second marriage, ii, 61-2; Fielding hospitality, iii, 302; William Young's absent-mindedness, i, 345; sets straight a passage in *Tom Jones*, ii, 125; gets Fielding's revised copy of *Amelia*, ii, 356; writes for *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 371-3, 378; has a file of it, iii, 204; edits *The Gray's Inn Journal*, ii, 372-3, 424; commends Garrick, ii, 426; Hogarth's portrait of Fielding, iii, 72; Allen's benefactions to Fielding's children, iii, 117; *The Upholsterer*, iii, 126, 154, 156, 352.

MURPHY, James Cavanah, iii, 66-8.

MURRAY, William (Lord Mansfield), ii, 5.

MUSÄUS, J. K. A., iii, 192-3.

MUSGRAVE, William, i, 422.

NAPTON, Agnes de, i, 2, 4.

NEVILLE, Rev. Christopher, iii, 68-9.

NEWCASTLE, Thomas, Duke of, in *The Welsh Opera*, i, 107; Perceval's attack on, ii, 93; the Penlez case, ii, 236-7, 239; grants John Fielding £200 a year, ii, 243, iii, 118; Fielding's letter recommending Pentlow,

ii, 253; asks Fielding's advice as to street robberies, ii, 283-4, iii, 7-8; the Canning case, ii, 289-91, 299, iii, 363; in *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 91; John Fielding dedicates a pamphlet to him, and is knighted, iii, 114; Hawkins on his relation to Fielding, iii, 162; mentioned, i, 328, ii, 13.

NEWDIGATE, Sir Roger, iii, 82.

NEWNHAM, Robert de, i, 4.

NEWTON, Thomas, i, 351, 378.

NICHOLS, John, iii, 73, 147-8, 204.

NORTHUMBERLAND, Duke of, iii, 108-9, 329.

NOURSE, John, Fielding's letter asking him to look for a house, i, 248-9, iii, 360; Fielding's letter about *True Greatness* and *The Vernoniad*, i, 288, 291, iii, 331, 361; a partner in *The Champion*, i, 250, 285, 288; pays Fielding for *The History of Charles XII*, i, 284, iii, 360, and publishes it, i, 285, iii, 337; prints *Histoire de Tom Jones*, ii, 140.

NUTT, Mrs., ii, 64, iii, 316.

*Ode to the New Year*, a parody by Fielding, i, 211.

ODELL, Thomas, i, 76, 202.

*Of Good Nature*, see *Good Nature*.

O'HARA, Kane, iii, 154-5, 355.

*Old Debauchees*, date of writing, i, 125; described, i, 126-7, 132, iii, 142; published, i, 125, 134, iii, 359; performed, i, 127, 129-31, ii, 32; attacked in *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 125, 132-4, 140; Fielding defends it, i, 136-7; bibliography, iii, 295, 311, 328.

*Old England*, ii, 13, 61, 63, 67, 79, 83, 86, 89, 93, 95, 102, 114, 119-20, 129, 140, 152-4, 156, 164, 233, 240, 267, 339, 387-9, iii, 262.

*Old Man taught Wisdom: or, The Virgin Unmask'd*, commonly known

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

by sub-title, performed, i, 170, 217, 368-71; published, iii, 298; described, i, 170; Hogarth's ticket, i, 171; relation to *Miss Lucy in Town*, i, 368; bibliography, iii, 298-9, 311, 328.

OLDFIELD, Mrs., in *The Provok'd Husband*, i, 61, 89; in *Love in Several Masques*, i, 62-3, iii, 219; *The Wedding Day* intended for, i, 74, 373.

OLIVER, Rev. Mr., i, 22-4, 175, 308.

*Opera of Operas*, *see* Hatchett, W., and Haywood, Mrs. Eliza.

Opposition, *The*, i, 298, 301, 422, iii, 305, 334.

ORFORD, Countess of, ii, 47.

OSON, Jan, i, 69.

OTWAY, Thomas, ii, 229.

*Ovid's Art of Love Paraphrased*, *see* *Lover's Assistant*.

OXFORD, Robert Harley, Earl of, ii, 72.

PACEY, Henry Butler, ii, 253.

PAGE, Sir Francis, ii, 3.

PALMER, John, iii, 126, 169.

*Pamela*, *see* *Shamela* and *Joseph Andrews*.

PARSONS, Humphrey, i, 395.

*Particular Account of Cardinal Fleury's Journey*, ii, 4, iii, 343.

*Pasquin*, sketched, i, 177; described, i, 180-7, 219, 230, 299, 408, 415, ii, 59; rejected by Rich, i, 178; performed, i, 180, 187-9, 191, iii, 146, 155; Lacy acts in, i, 233; its reception, i, 188-91, 195, 197-8, 202-3, 205, 216-7, iii, 140; published, i, 187, 192; *A Key to Pasquin*, i, 189; *Marforio*, a satire on *Pasquin*, i, 191-2; Aaron Hill on *Pasquin*, i, 195; Hogarth's benefit ticket, i, 196-7; did Pope attend a performance? i, 196-7, 365; should be acted in every

borough, i, 218; cartooned, i, 270-1; Thornton ridicules it, ii, 401; in Cibber's *Apology*, i, 272; *Tumble-Down Dick*, a continuation of it, i, 193; emerges as Sheridan's *Critic*, iii, 156; Murphy's estimate of it, iii, 183, 140-1; Fanny Burney's estimate of it, iii, 155; Warton's, iii, 155; Thackeray could not have read it, iii, 214; mentioned, i, 277, iii, 103; bibliography, iii, 299, 311, 328. *Pasquin* (newspaper), i, 179.

PASQUIN (pseudonym of Fielding), i, 179, 220-1, 238, 260, iii, 265.

*Patriot*, *The*, i, 262.

*Paysan Parvenu*, *see* Marivaux.

PEARCE, Daniel, ii, 167.

PEELE, George, iii, 232.

PELHAM, Henry, ii, 13, 51, 62-3, 74, 79, 82, 93, 95, 173, 271-2, 388, iii, 10, 15, 17, 266, 325.

PEMBROKE, Countess of, i, 382.

PENDARVES, Mary Granville, *see* Delany.

PENLEZ, Bosavern, ii, 236-40, 242, 247, 251, iii, 128-9, 319, 332.

PENTLOW, William, ii, 253-4.

PEPPYS, Samuel, i, 10.

PERCEVAL, John, 2d Earl of Egmont, ii, 93-4, iii, 339.

PERKINS, Hutton, ii, 249, iii, 363.

*Phaeton in the Suds*, *see* *Tumble-Down Dick*.

PHILAETHES (pseudonym of Fielding), i, 135-9, iii, 296.

PHILIDOR, A. D., iii, 181, 352.

PHILIPS, Ambrose, i, 127, 161.

PHILLIMORE, Sir Robert, iii, 362.

PHILLIPS, Thomas, i, 199, 202.

*Philosophical Transactions*, iii, 329.

PHINN, Thomas, iii, 73.

PIERCE, William, ii, 303, 375.

PINKETHMAN, William, i, 76, 78.

PIOZZI, Mrs., ii, 304.

PITT, Thomas, *see* Freeman, Ralph.

# INDEX

PITT, William, at Eton with Fielding, i, 41-2; subscribes for the *Miscellanies*, i, 382; guest with Fielding at Sanderson Miller's, ii, 112-6, 180, 216; arouses curiosity about *Tom Jones*, and commends it, ii, 118, 127, 129; makes no mention of Fielding in his writings, ii, 127; mentioned, i, 179, 249, 376, 387, ii, 13, 63, 173, 268, iii, 266.

PITT, Mrs. William, ii, 47.

*Plain Truth*, a poem by Fielding, i, 383-4, iii, 327, 334.

*Plain Truth*, a political dialogue in prose, i, 297-8, iii, 338.

*Plan of the Universal Register Office*, see *Universal Register Office*.

PLAUTUS, i, 338, iii, 297.

PLAYER, Thomas, iii, 34.

Plutus, i, 363-6, iii, 307, 334.

POE, E. A., iii, 230.

POINSINET, Antoine, iii, 181-2, 352. *Pompey the Little*, see *Coventry, Francis*.

POPE, Alexander, read by Fielding when a boy, i, 45, 47; quarrel with Ralph, i, 74-5; Fielding's pseudonym *Scriblerus Secundus*, i, 80; his attack upon Mrs. Haywood, i, 84; in *The Champion*, i, 283; in *True Greatness*, i, 288-9; in *The Vernoniad*, i, 291; in *Plutus*, i, 363, 365-7; in *Journey from this World*, i, 399; puts Cooke into *The Dunciad*, i, 96; attacks Cibber in *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 122-3, 366; attacks Fielding, i, 123, 132-4, 160; satirizes Walter, i, 176, and Lord Hervey, i, 310; did he see *Pasquin?* i, 196-7; praises Ralph Allen, i, 376, and visits him, i, 377; writes about the *Miscellanies*, i, 382-3; Fielding imitates him, i, 83, 384-5, ii, 82; Smollett imitates him, ii, 398; Warton's edition of and life, ii, 45, iii, 132; friend-

ship with Mildmay, ii, 166; quoted by Fielding, ii, 400; Fielding rarely drew satirical portraits, iii, 279, and no malicious ones, ii, 430; in Sir John Fielding's jests, iii, 115, 265; Beattie asks Lyttelton about him, iii, 151; appears in Hogarth's *Distrest Poet*, iii, 270; *Blast upon Blast* and *The Cudgel* not by Fielding, iii, 342; Fielding's opinion of, i, 134, 264, 365-6, ii, 84; relations between Fielding and, i, 366-7, 377; mentioned, i, 58, 99, ii, 82, 116, 228.

POPE, F. J., documents relating to Fielding, i, 36 n, iii, 249.

POPPLE, William, i, 171, 195.

PORCUPINE Pelagius, see Kenrick, William.

PORCUPINUS Pelagius, see Morgan, Macnamara.

PORLAND, Duke of, ii, 303, iii, 5.

PRATT, Charles, see Camden, Lord.

PRATT, Samuel J., iii, 354.

PRESTON, Sir Richard, i, 9.

PRICE, Henry, i, 165-6.

PRIDEAUX, Humphrey, ii, 102.

PRIDEAUX, W. F., ii, 57 n, iii, 73.

PRIOR, Matthew, ii, 228, iii, 163.

PRITCHARD, Mrs., i, 374, iii, 169.

*Prompter, The*, i, 171, 188-92, 195, 252.

*Proper Answer to a Late Scurrilous Libel*, ii, 17, 74, 76, iii, 310, 315, 334.

*Proposal for making an Effectual Provision for the Poor*, ii, 271-4, 279, iii, 6, 128, 325, 333.

*Public Advertiser*, ii, 224 n, 285, 428-9, iii, 17 n, 64, 83, 324, 347-8.

PUISIEUX, Philippe F. de, iii, 179.

PULTENEY, William, Earl of Bath, opposes Walpole, i, 103, 179, 270; writes for *The Craftsman*, i, 104; in *The Welsh Opera*, i, 106-7; Fielding's sympathies with, i, 116, 290; Lord Hervey deserts him, i, 182;

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

opposes the Licensing Act, i, 229-31; turns courtier and accepts a peerage, i, 411-2; mentioned, iii, 352.

PYNE, W. H., iii, 147.

QUIN, James, i, 171, 384, ii, 50, 89, 376, iii, 43, 91.

RABELAIS, François, ii, 433.

RAFTOR, Miss, *see* Clive, Mrs. Catherine.

RALEIGH, Sir Walter, iii, 253.

RALPH, James, goes to England with Franklin, i, 74; quarrels with Pope, i, 74-5; Fielding's relations with, i, 74-6; writes prologue for *The Temple Beau*, i, 76-7; in *The Battle of the Poets*, i, 96-7; with Fielding at The Little Theatre, i, 178; *The Astrologer*, i, 198; writes denunciations of the ministry, i, 251; associated with Fielding on *The Champion*, i, 250, 254-7, 259-60, 262-3, 301, iii, 1, 280; Curril dedicates a pamphlet to, i, 274; may have translated the *History of Charles XII*, i, 287; replies to the Duchess of Marlborough, i, 360; not a contributor to *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 385; his *History of England*, iii, 77; mentioned, i, 297-8.

RAMSAY, Allan, ii, 133, 161, 298.

RANBY, Dr. John, ii, 173, 195 n, 290 n, 355-6, 379, iii, 7, 266.

RANELAGH, Lady, ii, 170.

*Rape upon Rape*, *see* *Coffee-House Politician*.

RAPHA, Anne or Eleanor, *see* Fielding, Anne.

*Rapsody*, i, 87; *see also* Swift, Jonathan.

REDMAN, shopkeeper, ii, 303.

REED, Isaac, iii, 330.

REED, Joseph, iii, 169-70, 182, 353.

REEVE, Clara, iii, 171-2, 175.

REGNARD, Jean F., i, 154, iii, 297.

*Rehearsal*, *The*, *see* Buckingham.

*Rehearsal of Kings*, i, 208-10, iii, 336.

*Remedy of Affliction*, i, 388, iii, 329.

*Remembrancer, The*, ii, 77.

REYNOLDS, John, ii, 269.

REYNOLDS, Sir Joshua, iii, 161.

RHODES, Ambrose (father), i, 50-2.

RHODES, Ambrose (son), i, 50-2.

RICCOBONI, Mme., iii, 179, 184.

RICH, Elizabeth, ii, 244.

RICH, John, at Lincoln's Inn Fields, i, 58, 83, 153; at Covent Garden, i, 143, 153, 156, 177, iii, 393, 411; rejects *Pasquin*, i, 178; satirized in *Pasquin*, i, 185; quarrel with Fielding, i, 191-5, 204, 269; *Marforio*, i, 191-2; rejects *The Wedding Day*, i, 373; revives *The Harlequin Sorcerer*, ii, 229; rejects Hill's *Orpheus*, ii, 389-90; rivalry with Garrick, ii, 422-3, 426; mentioned, ii, 377.

RICH, Sir Robert, ii, 244.

RICHARDSON, Samuel, Sarah Fielding's friendship with, i, 20, ii, 61, 116, 350, iii, 38, 112-3, 282; subscribes to *The Familiar Letters*, but not to the *Miscellanies*, ii, 47; the Collier sisters write to him, ii, 116, iii, 38, 95-6; Thomas Edwards writes to him, iii, 97; keeps letters from his admirers, i, 313, 357; on *Joseph Andrews*, i, 344, ii, 159; on *David Simple*, ii, 8; on *Tom Jones*, ii, 141-50, 161, 215, 218, 350, iii, 228; on *Amelia*, ii, 349-51; Scott quotes what he says of Fielding, iii, 210; his estimate of Fielding, ii, 8, iii, 159, 195-6; Dr. Johnson committed to his interests, ii, 130, iii, 157-60; championed by *The Gentleman's Magazine*, ii, 130-1; Fielding extends olive branch to, ii, 90, and praises him, ii, 90, 141-2; dislikes

# INDEX

his epistolary style, ii, 48; his only fling at, iii, 282; Fielding quotes him, ii, 437; protests against his formal morality, iii, 188; his attitude towards Fielding, iii, 157; Fielding's estimate of, iii, 63-4, 282-3; Boswell prefers Fielding to him, iii, 161; compared with Fielding, ii, 127, 135, iii, 153, 159, 275; the number of translations of his works, iii, 178; his influence on German fiction, iii, 191-2, 194; his influence fades, iii, 177; *Clarissa*, i, 143, ii, 159; rivalry with *Tom Jones*, ii, 126; *Pamela*, i, 301-2, ii, 323; adds to it, ii, 46; parodied, i, 303, 309-10, 312-3 (see also *Shamela*); its relation to *Joseph Andrews*, i, 316-9, ii, 99; its art, ii, 158; its popularity, i, 355, 357; the writing of it, iii, 273; Fielding ridicules Mr. B. in, i, 317, 320; *Sir Charles Grandison*, ii, 348; Mrs. Barbauld's estimate of him, iii, 199-201; William H. Brown's, iii, 175; Fanny Burney's, iii, 160; Canning's, iii, 173; Chalmers's, iii, 204; Coleridge's, iii, 176; Mrs. Delany's, ii, 310; Henley's, iii, 254, 256; Johnson's, iii, 167; Hester Mulso's, ii, 347; Southey's, iii, 205; Stephen's, iii, 239-40; Texte's, iii, 178; his slur upon Charlotte Fielding, ii, 218, iii, 210, 235, 238, 256; no novels by him in Fielding's library, iii, 79; mentioned, i, 416, iii, 60.

RICHMOND, Charles, 2d Duke of, i, 143-4, 250, 382, 384, iii, 266, 297.

RICHMOND, Charles, son of the 2d Duke of, i, 391.

RICHMOND, Duchess of, i, 144, 382.

RIGBY, Richard, ii, 227-8, 287, iii, 137.

*Roast Beef of Old England*, i, 109, 157, 235, iii, 153.

ROBBINS, Alfred J., iii, 340.

ROBERTS, James, bookseller, publishes *Masquerade*, iii, 290, *Author's Farce*, iii, 291, *Tom Thumb*, iii, 291, *Tragedy of Tragedies*, iii, 292, *Letter-Writers*, iii, 292, *Grub-Street Opera*, iii, 298, *Old Debauchees*, iii, 294, *Historical Register*, iii, 301, *Full Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough*, iii, 307, *Papers Proper to be Read*, i, 390, iii, 308, *Opera of Operas*, iii, 351.

ROBERTS, James, engraver, iii, 73.

ROBERTS, John, i, 187, 196, 200, 204, 208, 217.

ROBERTS, Mrs., of Ryde, iii, 38-9, 96.

ROBINSON, Luke, ii, 253.

ROCHESTER, Lord, i, 390.

*Roderick Random*, see Smollett.

ROGERS, Samuel, iii, 156.

ROLT, Richard, ii, 63.

ROOKES, Mary, i, 29, 35, 37.

RORKE, Kate, iii, 358.

ROSCOE, Thomas, his edition of Fielding, iii, 74, 128-9, 220; Thackeray reads it, iii, 213; and reviews it, iii, 214, 217-8; bibliography, iii, 331-2, 361, 366.

*Roue de Fortune*, see Lake, Eliza.

ROUSSEAU, J. J., iii, 187.

ROWE, Nicholas, i, 197, ii, 50.

ROXBOROUGH, Duke of, iii, 3, 266.

RUSSEL, editor of *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 122.

RUSSELL, Lord John, iii, 121.

RYDER, Sir Dudley, i, 355.

St. James's Chronicle, iii, 107, 108 n, 170 n.

St. James's Evening Post, i, 355 n, ii, 117, 121, 123, 223, 224 n, 231 n, 237 n, 238 n, iii, 28 n.

ST. JOHN, Sir Paulet, ii, 166, 196.

SAINTSBURY, G. E. B., iii, 253-4, 333-5.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

*Salisbury Journal*, ii, 167.

SALMON, Thomas (or Nathaniel), i, 100.

SALT, lawyer, ii, 287-8, 294, 297-8.

SANDYS, Samuel, i, 270-1.

SAVAGE, Richard, ii, 116.

SCARRON, Paul, i, 330.

*Scheme for Raising . . . Money*, iii, 344.

SCHILLER, iii, 194.

SCHRÖDER, F. L., iii, 356.

*Scots Magazine*, i, 409 n, ii, 386.

SCOTT, Sir Walter, on the reception of *Tom Jones*, ii, 126; on its art, ii, 177, 211, iii, 133, 207-8; on Fielding's low life, ii, 216; on Rigby's anecdote of Fielding, ii, 228; on the publication of *Amelia*, ii, 305; calls *Amelia* a continuation of *Tom Jones*, ii, 323; parallel between Smollett and Fielding, iii, 166-7, 209; Taine depicts him as a realist, iii, 188-9; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 209-13; Thackeray on his art, iii, 215; his ignorance of law, iii, 228; Charlotte Brontë's estimate of his novels, iii, 231; misquotes the title of *The Jacobite's Journal*, iii, 233; mentioned, ii, 201.

SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS, pseudonym of Fielding, i, 80, 99-100, 110, iii, 290-3.

SCRIBLERUS TERTIUS, pseudonym of Thomas Cooke, i, 96, iii, 350, and of another versifier, i, 113 n.

SCRIBLERUS THEATRICUS, i, 161.

SECKER, Thomas, ii, 346.

SEDGLY, Ben, ii, 266-7, 409.

SEEDO, Mr., i, 117.

SÉGUR, A. J. P. de, iii, 185, 356.

SELWIN, William, ii, 242.

*Serious Address to the People of Great Britain*, ii, 14-5, 17, iii, 130, 310.

SHADWELL, Thomas, i, 140.

SHAFTESBURY, Countess of, i, 382.

SHAFTESBURY, Earl of, ii, 212, 221, iii, 19, 79, 163, 169.

SHAKESPEARE, William, Fielding reads him in boyhood, i, 47, iii, 78; "a name unknown" to Fielding, i, 112; made over by Colley Cibber, i, 150, 212, ii, 432, iii, 281-2; word-confusions in, i, 308; Warburton's edition of his plays, ii, 131, 432; Theobald's edition, ii, 432; depicts characters from real life, ii, 207, iii, 264; uncertainty of birth as a *motif*, ii, 218; his Dogberry, ii, 252; his representation of a terrible death, ii, 264; compared with Racine, ii, 375, 432; as a humorist, ii, 433; in France and Germany, iii, 178, 193-4; Johnson on how he should be read, iii, 203; his knowledge of law, iii, 228; Charlotte Brontë on his comedies, iii, 231; breaks the barriers of convention, iii, 259; his repugnance to tobacco, iii, 260; writes *The Merry Wives* in a fortnight, iii, 273; his Mrs. Quickly, iii, 275; mentioned, i, 197, 204, 399, ii, 407, iii, 31, 215, 245, 255.

Shamela, Fielding's tutor in, i, 23, 308; Fielding's authorship of, i, 23, 303-9; described, i, 310-3, 320, ii, 160, 437, iii, 63; Parson Williams in, i, 328; bibliography, iii, 283, 303-4.

SHARP, J., bookseller, ii, 404.

*Sharpe's London Magazine*, iii, 232.

SHENSTONE, William, ii, 110, 117, 127, 128 n, iii, 346.

SHERIDAN, R. B., retouches *The Fathers*, iii, 104; produces it, iii, 105-8; incidents and characters appropriated from Fielding's novels and plays, i, 340, iii, 156-7.

SHERLOCK, Thomas, Bishop, ii, 155.

SHUTER, Edward, iii, 169.

# INDEX

SIDNEY, Sir Philip, iii, 156.  
*Sir Peevy Pet*, i, 209, iii, 336.  
SKERRETT, Maria, i, 107, 408, 423.  
SMART, Christopher, his estimate of Fielding, ii, 133, iii, 266; publishes *The Student*, ii, 266, 400, iii, 321; his poems in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, ii, 381-2; Hill's interview with Fielding, ii, 396; burlesqued by Kenrick, ii, 409-10, and by Macklin, ii, 413; in Hill's *The Impertinent*, ii, 421-2, 424, 426; epitaph on Fielding, iii, 110.

SMITH, Adam, ii, 266.

SMITH, Charlotte, iii, 206.

SMITH, John (thief), ii, 391.

SMITH, Samuel, ii, 167.

SMOLLETT, Tobias, says the Dutch lack humour, i, 70; Fielding and *The True Patriot*, ii, 18; *The Tears of Scotland*, ii, 57; on Fielding's second marriage, ii, 61-2, iii, 137; anecdote of Jacobite sportsmen, ii, 66; Fielding reads *Roderick Random*, ii, 91; Lady Mary Montagu thought Fielding wrote it, ii, 303, iii, 345; *Peregrine Pickle*, ii, 61, 312; on Amelia, ii, 339; attacks Fielding in retaliation for banter, ii, 393, 397-8, 402, iii, 198; burlesqued by Thornton, ii, 404, and by Kenrick, ii, 408; on Dr. Thumpscull, iii, 3; his portrait, iii, 71, 74; his fame, iii, 153; Sheridan's estimate of his novels, iii, 156; his estimate of Fielding, ii, 400, iii, 157; Fanny Burney's estimate of, iii, 160; Dr. John Moore's estimate of, iii, 163-4; William Godwin's estimate of, iii, 164-6; Scott's estimate of, iii, 166-7, 208-9; Crabbe's estimate of, iii, 170; Taine's estimate of, iii, 188; the humour of Dickens akin to his, iii, 229; Stephen's estimate of, iii, 240; Henley's estimate of, iii, 254; compared with Swift and Fielding, iii, 276; his *Faithful Narrative*, ii, 397-9, iii, 346; mentioned, iii, 175.

*Some Papers Proper to be Read before . . .*, i, 390, iii, 308.

SOMERSET, Duchess of, *see* Hertford, Lady.

*Sot, The*, *see* Arne.

SOUTH, Dr. Robert, ii, 437, iii, 19.

SOUTHEY, Robert, iii, 97, 122, 205, 232.

SOUTHWELL, Lord, i, 56.

*Speech made in the Censorial Court*, ii, 405-6, iii, 347.

SPENCER, Lady, iii, 105-6.

*Spring-Garden Journal*, ii, 425, 429 n.

SQUIRE, Samuel, ii, 88.

*Squire Badger*, *see* Arne.

SQUIRES, Mary, ii, 286-9, 292, 294-5, 297, 299, iii, 325.

STANHOPE, Bridget, *see* Fielding, Bridget (Stanhope).

STANHOPE, William, 1st Earl of Harrington, *see* Harrington.

STEELE, Sir R., i, 254, 276, 334, 400, ii, 391, iii, 79.

STEFFENS, J. H., iii, 353.

STENDHAL [M. H. Beyle], iii, 187.

STEPHEN, Sir Leslie, his edition of Fielding's works, iii, 129-30, 323, 332-3; on Murphy's life of Fielding, iii, 147; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 239-48, 253.

STERNE, Laurence, his Eliza, i, 71; on good and bad names, i, 264; Dr. James's powder, ii, 355; a footman's account of his death, iii, 120; his influence fades, iii, 177; Texte subordinates Fielding to, iii, 178; Bode translates him, iii, 190; relation of Lytton's *The Caxtons* to, iii, 230; mentioned, i, 280, iii, 74, 175.

STEVENSON, R. L., iii, 250.

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

STILLINGFLEET, Robert, i, 240, 258, ii, 168, iii, 360.

STOPLER, actor, i, 150.

STOWE, Harriet Beecher, iii, 230.

STRAFFORD, Countess of, i, 382.

STRAHAN, William, prints *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 64, iii, 316; his ledger entries about *Amelia*, ii, 304-5 n, 308, iii, 321; about *Joseph Andrews*, i, 355 n, 381 n; about *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 86.

STRANGE, Sir John, ii, 5.

STUART, Lady Louisa, ii, 11, 61-2, 128.

STUBBS, John, iii, 53-4, 59.

Student, *The*, ii, 266-7, 267 n, 400, iii, 321.

*Stultus versus Sapientem*, ii, 137-9, iii, 319.

SWIFT, Jonathan, Fielding reads him in youth, i, 46-7, 53; Swift forms his style on Lucian, i, 47; Fielding's *Masquerade* in the style of, i, 60; Fielding and the Scriblerus Club, i, 80; sees *Tom Thumb* performed, and is perplexed, i, 87-8, iii, 155; links Fielding with Welsted, i, 87; Mrs. Pendarves writes to him, i, 188; in *The Champion*, i, 264, 276, 283; thinks scientific discoveries ridiculous, i, 391; the Swift-like irony of the *Journey from this World*, i, 404; method of his political allegories, i, 421; Fielding's irony less bitter than Swift's, i, 424; Fielding's estimate of, ii, 26-7, 433-6, iii, 276; dines with Earl Bathurst, ii, 228; his *Modest Proposal*, ii, 363; Murphy's estimate of, ii, 372; his *Battle of the Books*, ii, 392; in Sir John Fielding's *Jests*, iii, 115; Beatrice asks Lyttelton about, iii, 151; Johnson dislikes him, iii, 163; Wordsworth reads him, iii, 172.

TAINÉ, H. A., his estimate of Fielding, iii, 187-9.

TALBOT, Catherine, ii, 346-7.

TALBOT, Lord, i, 363-4.

TAYLOR, Charles H., iii, 358.

TAYLOR, Isaac, iii, 73, 83.

TAYLOR, Peter, iii, 57.

TAYLOR, Dr. Robert, iii, 82.

*Temple Beau*, written, i, 74; described, i, 77-9, ii, 325; its realism, iii, 135; performed, i, 76-7, 97; published, i, 77; Dr. Hoadly draws upon it, iii, 154; bibliography, iii, 290, 311, 328.

TENNYSON, Alfred, iii, 175.

TEXTE, Joseph, iii, 178, 180, 349.

THACKERAY, W. M., his description of Tom Jones, ii, 171; on the morality of *Tom Jones*, ii, 216; reads *Joseph Andrews*, iii, 175, 213; Taine on, iii, 188; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 213-25, 226, 229, 231-2, 234, 236, 238-9, 253-5; Dickson's paper on, iii, 248; *The History of Hickathrift*, iii, 340; mentioned, i, 14, ii, 201, iii, 227, 270, 276.

THEOBALD, Lewis, i, 96, 100, 365-6, 400, ii, 229, 389, 423, 432.

THOMAS, Margaret, iii, 74, 251.

THOMAS, William, iii, 67.

THOMPSON, Alexander M., iii, 358.

THOMPSON, Dr. Thomas, account of, iii, 3; his treatment of Winnington, ii, 72, 247, 356; attends Fielding, ii, 72, 247-8, iii, 3-4, and his daughter Mary, ii, 248; in *Amelia*, ii, 354-6, iii, 3, and in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, iii, 3; Fielding takes him out of *Amelia*, ii, 356, iii, 5, and dismisses him, iii, 14.

THOMS, W. J., iii, 341.

THOMSON, James, his new *Sophonisba*, i, 83, 86, 100; Hoadly's *Contrast* aimed at, i, 113; Fielding classed with him, i, 161; anecdote

# INDEX

about *Joseph Andrews*, i, 315; befriended by Lord Talbot, i, 363; Fielding on the death of, ii, 65; Fielding on his *Castle of Indolence*, ii, 90; Lady Hertford receives his homage, ii, 116; his advice about *Clarissa*, ii, 142; mentioned, i, 264, ii, 20.

THORNE, Fred, iii, 358.

THORNE, Thomas, iii, 358.

THORNTON, Bonnell, attacks Fielding's style, ii, 342; account of, ii, 400-1; publishes *The Drury-Lane Journal*, ii, 401-2, 404, 412; attacks Fielding, ii, 402-3, 405, 429-30; *The Covent-Garden Journal Extraordinary*, ii, 404, iii, 323; *A Speech made in the Censorial Court*, ii, 405-7, iii, 347; Kenrick parodies him, ii, 407; his account of *The Covent Garden Theatre*, ii, 412-3; on the Robinhoodians, ii, 419; his *Spring-Garden Journal*, ii, 425, 429 n; attacks Hill, ii, 426.

*To a Friend on the Choice of a Wife*, i, 384.

*To Dramaticus*, i, 133, iii, 295-6.

*To John Hayes, Esq.*, i, 384.

*To Mr. Fielding*, i, 161-2.

*To the Author of the Daily Post*, i, 135-9, iii, 296.

*To the Author of the Gazetteer*, i, 220-2, iii, 301.

*To the Nymphs of New Sarum*, ii, 330.

*To the Public*, iii, 334.

*Tom Jones*, date of writing, ii, 100-8, iii, 145, 272-3; place of writing, ii, 108-12; seen in manuscript by Lyttelton and others, or in advance copies, i, 41, ii, 113, 116-7, 129, 216; the dedication, i, 42, ii, 37, 53, 100, 115, 398; its sub-title taken from Moore's *The Foundling*, ii, 90; the initial chapters to the books, ii, 221-2; the copyright agreements, ii, 108,

118-20, 125, 226, iii, 361-2; published, ii, 117-20, 307, iii, 316-7; revised, and new editions published, ii, 120-5, iii, 317-8.

The novel described, ii, 177-88; its scene, i, 17, 379, ii, 164-9, 173, 179-80, 182-3, 223, 283; its characters, i, 52, 131, 145, 167, 240, 342, 379, ii, 36, 101, 204-20, iii, 11, 103, 105, 175, 181, 275, 283-5; their ages, ii, 195-6; their identification, i, 163, ii, 162-76, 283; their full names, ii, 196-7; some bear real names, ii, 173-6, 387, iii, 191; its time scheme, ii, 188-95, 326; discrepancies in, ii, 164; slips in the narrative, ii, 197-201; Dutch terms in, i, 69; its list of the world's great humorists, ii, 382, 433; its plot, ii, 160-2, 177, 201-4, 220-1; its art, ii, 158-222, iii, 284-5; its realism, i, 65, ii, 127, 207, 219-21, 328, iii, 3, 187, 267, 275; its morality, ii, 212-9, 284-5, iii, 169-76, 206.

The novel compared with *Don Quixote*, ii, 160, 205; *Robinson Crusoe*, ii, 158; *Moll Flanders*, ii, 158; *The Cry*, iii, 12; *Pamela*, ii, 158-60; *Clarissa*, ii, 159; Sheridan's works, iii, 156-7; *Waverley*, iii, 208; Thackeray's works, iii, 213; *Amelia*, ii, 323, 328, 353, 356, 437, iii, 166-7; *Jonathan Wild*, ii, 219; *Miss Lucy*, ii, 202; *Joseph Andrews*, ii, 159, 179, 205, iii, 167; *Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 96; leading articles in *Covent-Garden Journal* and other periodicals, i, 280-1, 410, iii, 131.

Its reception on publication, ii, 126-56; as compared with *Joseph Andrews*, i, 357; rivalry with *Clarissa*, ii, 126-7; reviewed in *The London Magazine*, ii, 129-30, 309, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, ii, 130-2, *The Ladies Magazine*, ii, 132-3, *Old England*, ii, 152-6; *The Monthly Review* praises

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

it, ii, 132; other contemporary critics, ii, 136-9, 153; Prince Charles Edward asks for it, ii, 36.

Estimate of the novel by Dr. Robert Anderson, iii, 164; Mrs. Barbauld, iii, 199; Beattie, iii, 168; *Blackwood's Magazine*, iii, 228-9; Boswell, iii, 161; Lady Bradshaigh, ii, 143-5; Mary Brunton, iii, 207; Samuel Butler, iii, 253; Canning, iii, 173; B. M. Carew, ii, 150-2; Coleridge, ii, 161, 216-7, iii, 176; Colman, iii, 169; J. B. Defreval, ii, 149; Mrs. Delany, ii, 310; Dickens, iii, 229; Madame du Defand, iii, 187; George Eliot, ii, 222; the Rev. W. Elwin, iii, 228; Elie C. Fréron, iii, 187; Gibbon, i, 1, iii, 168; Gilfillan, iii, 227; William Godwin, iii, 165; James Harris, iii, 152; Sir John Hawkins, iii, 163, 167, 171; Hazlitt, iii, 206; Henry, iii, 256; Aaron Hill's daughters, ii, 145-9, 161; Dr. John Hill, ii, 391, iii, 157; John Oliver Hobbes, iii, 175-6; Dr. Johnson, iii, 158-9; La Harpe, iii, 187; Lamb, iii, 206; Solomon Lowe, ii, 149; J. R. Lowell, iii, 230; Lady Luxborough, ii, 127, 161; T. J. Mathias, iii, 172; Sir A. Mitchell, ii, 305; Lord Monboddo, iii, 168; Lady Mary W. Montagu, i, 358, ii, 128-9; Dr. John Moore, iii, 164; Hannah More, iii, 159-60; William Mudford, iii, 201-4, 228; Murphy, iii, 132-3; Allan Ramsay, ii, 133, 161, 298; Sir J. Reynolds, iii, 161; Richardson, ii, 141-50, 161, 215, 218, iii, 228; Schiller, iii, 194; Scott, ii, 323, iii, 166, 207-12; Shenstone, ii, 127; Sheridan, iii, 156; Christopher Smart, ii, 133; Stendhal, iii, 187; Taine, iii, 187-9; Thackeray, ii, 216, iii, 214-5, 217, 223-7, 229; Bonnell Thornton, ii, 429; Vol-

taire, iii, 187; William Watson, iii, 228; E. P. Whipple, iii, 226-7; the novel expurgated, and burned, iii, 175.

Continuations and imitations, ii, 133-4, 303, 415, iii, 169-71, 180, 352-3, 355-7; foreign editions, translations, and imitations, iii, 178-9, 195, 317-9; in France, ii, 139, 221, iii, 180-90, 197, 352-3, 355-6; in Germany, iii, 190-4, 353.

No copy in Fielding's library, ii, 125, iii, 79; mentioned, i, 53, 61, 412, ii, 39, 46, 52, 98, 303, 306, 386, 389, iii, 123, 137, 336; bibliography, iii, 316-9, 328-9, 352-3, 355-6, 358, 361-2.

*Tom Jones in his Married State*, ii, 134, iii, 345.

*Tom Thumb: a Tragedy*, described, i, 85-8; performed and published, i, 85; Swift perplexed by it, i, 88; enlarged and published, i, 88-90, iii, 144; performed, i, 92-5, 97, 104, 107, 116, 143, 198, iii, 271; its relation to *The Battle of the Poets*, i, 95-7; again revised, enlarged, and produced, i, 98, as *The Tragedy of Tragedies*, q. v.; *The Grub-street Journal* parodies it, i, 112; ridiculed in *The Contrast*, i, 113; mockingly condemned by Fielding, i, 134; Murphy's estimate of, iii, 133; O'Hara founds a burletta on, iii, 154-5; Thackeray could not have read it, iii, 214; mentioned, i, 177, 180, 277, 292, 308, 310, 417, ii, 351, iii, 285; bibliography, iii, 291.

*TONSON*, Jacob, iii, 148-9, 185.

*TOUCH*, Charles, ii, 98.

*TOWNSHEND*, Charles, 2d Viscount, i, 104, 420-1.

*TOWNSHEND*, Lady, wife of 3d Viscount, ii, 171-2.

*Tragedy of Tragedies*, a revision of *Tom Thumb*, q. v.; Fielding writes

# INDEX

preface for, i, 68, 70, 99; described, i, 98-103; produced, i, 98; turned into an opera by Eliza Haywood and William Hatchett, *q. v.*; mentioned, iii, 281; bibliography, iii, 292, 311, 328, 333, 335.

TREAT, John, ii, 293.

*Treatise on the Office of Constable*, iii, 80, 83, 98-9, 328, 366.

TRELAWNY, Sir Jonathan, i, 11-2.

TREMBLEY, Abraham, i, 391-2.

TRENTHAM, Lord, ii, 237-8.

TROTTPLAID, John, a pseudonym of Fielding, ii, 64, see also *Jacobite's Journal*.

*True Greatness*, i, 251, 288-91, 384, iii, 302-3, 361.

*True Patriot*, launched by Fielding, ii, 18-20; described, ii, 20-39, 358; comes to an end, ii, 35, 38, 41-2, 44; Fielding's contributions to, ii, 39-41, 52, 56, 57 *n.*, 65, 92, 364, iii, 127, 129, 131; mentioned, i, 381, ii, 17, 46, 55, 63-4, 100-1, 105, 307, 371, 386; bibliography, iii, 312-3, 329.

*True State of the Case of Penlez*, see Penlez.

TUCKER, Andrew, i, 50-1, 63.

TUCKER, John, i, 50.

*Tumble-Down Dick*, described, i, 192-4; performed, i, 194-5, 198, 200-1; the dedication, i, 203; bibliography, iii, 299-300, 311, 328.

TUNBRIDGE, Lord, i, 14, 16.

*Universal Gallant*, i, 171-2, 177, 187, iii, 299, 311, 328.

*Universal Register Office* (article), ii, 359, iii, 346; see also Fielding, Sir John.

*Universal Register Office, Plan of the* (pamphlet), ii, 226, iii, 321.

*Universal Spectator*, i, 160.

UPCOTT, William, iii, 361.

UPTON, John, iii, 82.

VANBRUGH, Sir John, *The Provok'd Husband*, i, 61, 89; Fielding says he copies nature, i, 65; his *Aesop*, i, 149, 178; *Tom Jones* has his gay wit, ii, 160; his works in Fielding's library, iii, 79; mentioned, i, 139.

VANE, Lady, ii, 312.

VEAL (or Veale), Richard, iii, 22-8, 39, 44-5, 47, 49, 53-4, 56-8, 62, 87, 89-90, 94, 364.

VEIL, Sir Thomas de, *see de Veil*.

VERNON, Admiral, i, 291-3, 305, 382.

*Vernoniad*, i, 291-6, 301, 364, 383, iii, 303, 334, 361.

VERWER, P. A., iii, 179.

VILLIERS, Susan, Countess of Denbigh, *see Denbigh*.

VINEGAR, Capt. Hercules, name assumed by Fielding as editor of *The Champion*, *q. v.*, its origin, i, 251-2, sketch of the imaginary character, i, 253-4, 261; the pseudonym appropriated by other writers, i, 267, 367, ii, 238, iii, 342, 345.

*Virgin Unmask'd*, *see Old Man Taught Wisdom*.

VITRIARIUS, P. R., i, 66.

VOLTAIRE, iii, 187.

*Voyage to Lisbon*, planned and begun, iii, 30-1; details of the voyage, iii, 23-51; book prepared for the press, iii, 60; published, iii, 84; described, iii, 60-4, 128, 136, 205; its reception, iii, 92-7, 184, 246; the two versions, iii, 85-92, 127, 130; translations, iii, 179; mentioned, ii, 242, 284, 290, iii, 1, 254, 267; bibliography, iii, 326-7, 335.

WADE, General, ii, 164.

WALDSCHMIDT, Carl, iii, 192 *n.*, 353.

WALES, Prince of, *see Frederick*.

WALLER, T., i, 362.

WALLIS, Albany, iii, 101.

WALPOLE, Horace, says Fielding wrote *The Golden Rump*, i, 227-8, iii,

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

341; reads *Shamela*, and attributes it to Fielding, i, 306; attributes *Blast upon Blast* to him, i, 367, iii, 342; attends *Miss Lucy*, i, 369; denounces Lyttelton, ii, 80; on the amount paid for *Tom Jones*, ii, 120; characterizes "Old Mildmay," ii, 166; describes Rigby's visit to Fielding, ii, 227-8, 287, iii, 137, 210, 237, 254; robbed in Hyde Park, ii, 250; on Fielding's *Enquiry*, ii, 267; on *A Voyage to Lisbon*, iii, 94; his estimate of Fielding, iii, 157; on Johnson, iii, 163; on *Tom Jones*, iii, 187; quoted, ii, 31; says Fielding wrote *A Scheme for a Tax on Message Cards*, iii, 344.

WALPOLE, Horatio, i, 107, 292, ii, 250.

WALPOLE, Sir Robert, Fielding addresses facetious poems to, i, 75-6, 81, 384, iii, 135, 153, 234, 270, 327; takes thirty copies of *Hurlothrumbo*, i, 79, which is dedicated to him, i, 79, 112; determines to suppress stage ridicule of him, i, 111-2; Fielding modifies his attitude towards, i, 114, 116; *The Modern Husband* dedicated to, i, 121, iii, 294; *The Grub-street Journal* opposed to, i, 122-3; Chesterfield attacks him, i, 159; Duke of Marlborough sides against him, i, 172; the most renowned modern equilibrist, i, 179; Hervey deserts Pulteney for, i, 182, 215, 219; in *The Fall of Mortimer*, i, 108, 111; supports Barnard's bill to regulate the stage, i, 225; in *The Vision of the Golden Rump*, i, 226; Giffard hands over to him *The Golden Rump*, i, 227, which was not by Fielding, i, 228; Barnard's bill becomes the Licensing Act, i, 228-32; in *Common Sense*, i, 239, 409; in *The Champion*, i, 254, 257, 260, 262-3, 265-6, 270-1,

283, 408, iii, 63, 280; in *The Opposition*, i, 299-301; in *The Craftsman*, i, 103, 408; opposed by Lyttelton, ii, 62-3; flirts with the Jacobites, ii, 72-3; weakens and falls, i, 249-50, 301; Musgrave's history of him, i, 422-3; relations with Miss Skerrett, i, 107, 408, 412, 423; Fielding puts him into a proverb, i, 412; subscribes for the *Miscellanies*, i, 382; in *The Beggar's Opera*, i, 104-5, 408, and in *Polly*, i, 408; in Fielding's works, iii, 280-1; in *Tom Thumb*, i, 103, iii, 280; in *The Welsh Opera*, and *The Grub-Street Opera*, i, 106-9, 408; in *Pasquin*, i, 182, 408, iii, 156; in *The Historical Register*, i, 215-6, 222-4, 408, iii, 281; in *Eurydice Hiss'd*, i, 217; in *True Greatness*, i, 289-91; in *The Vernoniad*, i, 292-5; in *Jonathan Wild*, i, 410, 417, 420-2, iii, 10, 63, 238, 249, 281, 283; Fielding's final estimate of, iii, 63; mentioned, i, 104, 129, 203, 365, 411, ii, 4, 59, iii, 286.

WALTER, Peter, i, 176, 241, 348, 392, ii, 25, 168; *see also* Gualterus, Petrus.

WALTHER, George Conrad, ii, 140.

WALTON, Isaac, i, 13.

WALTON, Tristram, ii, 43.

WARBURTON, William, in *Tom Thumb*, i, 100; praises Ralph Allen, i, 376; stays with him, i, 377, ii, 127; in Fielding's *Journey*, i, 400; friend of Richard Graves, ii, 110; in *Tom Jones*, ii, 173; contributes to a charity, ii, 303; his edition of Shakespeare, ii, 432; deficient in humour, iii, 115; links Fielding with Marivaux, ii, 127, iii, 135, 169.

WARD, John, iii, 4.

WARD, Dr. Joshua, ii, 355-6, iii, 14-7.

WARTON, Joseph, anecdote of Field-

# INDEX

ing, ii, 45, iii, 167, 261, 265; his *Essay on Pope*, iii, 132; estimate of *Pasquin*, iii, 155, of Fielding, iii, 167.  
 WARTON, Thomas, ii, 45.  
 WASEY, Dr. William, i, 382.  
 WATSON, Sir William (1715-87), ii, 105.

WATSON, William, his life of Fielding, iii, 196-9, 204; Scott reads it, iii, 209; and quotes it, iii, 211; on *Tom Jones*, iii, 228.

WATT, Robert, iii, 341, 347.

WATTS, John, bookseller, publishes *Love in Several Masques*, i, 62 n, iii, 290, *Temple Beau*, iii, 290, *Rape upon Rape*, iii, 291, *The Lottery*, iii, 294, *Modish Couple*, iii, 294, *Modern Husband*, iii, 294, *Covent-Garden Tragedy*, iii, 295, 359, *Mock Doctor*, iii, 296, *Caelia*, iii, 296, *Miser*, iii, 297, *Intriguing Chambermaid*, iii, 298, *Don Quixote*, iii, 298, *Old Man taught Wisdom*, iii, 298, *Universal Gallant*, iii, 299, *Pasquin*, iii, 299, *Tumble-Down Dick*, iii, 300, *Debauchees*, iii, 311, 359, *Dramatic Works*, iii, 311, *Author's Farce*, iii, 320, *Select Comedies of Molière*, i, 144, iii, 335; receipt from Fielding to, iii, 359; Fielding's epigram on, i, 385.

WEBB, Colonel, i, 14.

*Wedding Day*, begun, i, 74, 373; rejected by Rich, i, 373; revised and performed, i, 373-5, 381, iii, 100, 141, 143-4, 227; printed, i, 374, 385; Macklin's prologue to, ii, 411; bibliography, iii, 308, 328, 356.

WELCH, Saunders, constable in the riots of 1749, ii, 226, 229, 235-6, 251; receives £200 a year as justice of the peace, ii, 243; publishes treatise for the guidance of constables, ii, 254; helps Fielding against vagabondage and gaming, ii, 262, 272, 281, 285, iii, 12, 16; Fielding asks for a com-

mission as justice of the peace for him, iii, 12-3, 14 n, 364; accompanies Fielding to Rotherhithe, iii, 24-5, 29; Fielding sends him cider and onions, iii, 40-1, 57; writes to Fielding, iii, 52-3; sends him a cheese, iii, 58; mentioned, ii, 302.

WELLER, George, ii, 6.

WELLS, John Edwin, Fielding's burlesque of Musgrave's *Walpole*, i, 422; identifies Fielding's articles and a poem in *The Champion*, i, 250, 254-5; Fielding's political purpose in *Jonathan Wild*, i, 422, iii, 249; on Captain Vinegar, i, 252 n; the earthquake of 1750, ii, 156.

WELLS, Susannah, ii, 286, 288-9.

*Welsh Opera: or, the Grey Mare the Better Horse*, described, i, 104-7; performed, i, 107-8; published, i, 110-11; rewritten and renamed *The Grub-Street Opera*, q. v., i, 108; bibliography, iii, 293.

WELSTED, Leonard, i, 87.

WESSELIUS, Johannes, i, 67.

WEST, Gilbert, i, 42.

WEST, Richard, i, 358-9.

*Westminster Journal*, ii, 63, 67, 266.

WESTMORELAND, Earl of, i, 382.

WHEATLEY, H. B., i, 197 n, iii, 72.

WHIPPLE, E. P., iii, 226-8.

WHITEFIELD, George, ii, 175, iii, 266.

WHITEFIELD, keeper of the Bell Inn, ii, 175, iii, 266.

*Whitehall Evening Post*, ii, 304 n, 307 n, iii, 9 n, 87.

WHITEHEAD, Thomas, iii, 118-9.

WHITING, Richard, i, 18.

WHITTINGHAM, Mary Ann, iii, 123.

WIDMER, G. R., iii, 349.

WIELAND, C. M., iii, 193-4.

WILKES, John, iii, 83.

WILKINSON, Tate, ii, 89.

WILKS, Robert, at the Theatre-

# THE HISTORY OF HENRY FIELDING

Royal, Drury Lane, i, 61, 142, 147; produces *Love in Several Masques*, i, 62; *The Wedding Day* intended for, i, 74, 373; burlesque of him in *The Author's Farce*, i, 82, 115, 150; has a rôle in *The Modern Husband*, i, 120; attacked in *The Grub-street Journal*, i, 123; his death, i, 142; Theophilus Cibber plays Macduff in succession to, i, 143; carries Lillo's *London Merchant* to the Queen, i, 199.

WILKS, Mrs., i, 147, 155.

WILLES, Lord Chief Justice, ii, 5, 31.

WILLIAMS, Sir Charles Hanbury, with Fielding at Eton, i, 41-2; verse dialogue between Earle and Dodington, i, 289; poem on Mrs. Clive, i, 374; subscribes for the *Miscellanies*, i, 382; epitaph on the Earl of Bath, i, 412; Rigby says Fielding sponged upon, ii, 227-8; Fielding submits *The Good-Natur'd Man* to him, iii, 100; friendship with Fielding, iii, 266.

WILLIAMS, Elisha, ii, 293.

WILLIAMS, John Hanbury, iii, 101.

WILLIAMSON, Rev. John, iii, 56, 59.

WILLOUGHBY, Richard, ii, 174.

WILMINGTON, Earl of, i, 300, 421-2, ii, 63.

WILMOT, Dr. Edward, i, 382.

WILSON, John, ii, 236-7, 239.

WINNINGTON, Thomas, his career, ii, 13, 72; subscribes to *The Familiar Letters*, ii, 47; his spurious autobiography, ii, 72-3; Fielding writes *A Proper Answer* to it, ii, 74; relation to Lady Townshend, ii, 171-2; his death, ii, 72, 247-8, 356; mentioned, ii, 20.

WOFFINGTON, Peg, rôle in *The Wedding Day*, i, 374; mentioned in the burlesque of Juvenal's *Sixth Satire*,

i, 385; Fielding writes an epilogue for her, ii, 32, iii, 338; mimicked by Foote, ii, 89.

WOOD, Augustus, iii, 192 n, 349.

WOOD, George, iii, 357.

WOOD, James, ii, 224.

WOOD, Thomas, iii, 80, 365.

WOODFALL, George, ii, 18, 52, 64, iii, 312, 313, 316.

WOODFALL, Henry, prints *Joseph Andrews*, i, 316, 352; proposals for the *Miscellanies*, i, 380; subscription blanks for *The Familiar Letters*, ii, 46; *The General Advertiser* and *The Public Advertiser*, ii, 428.

WOODROFFE, Benjamin, i, 11.

WOODWARD, Henry, in *The Battle of the Poets*, i, 96; his *Beggar's Pantomime*, i, 211; his *Harlequin Ranger*, ii, 423; his quarrel with Fitzpatrick and Hill, ii, 423-6, iii, 348; buys classics from Fielding's library, iii, 82; in *The Upholsterer*, iii, 126.

WORDSWORTH, Dorothy, iii, 172-3.

WORDSWORTH, William, iii, 172, 270.

WORLIDGE, Thomas, ii, 295.

WRAXALL, Sir N. W., ii, 305-7, iii, 65-6, 152.

WRAY, Daniel, iii, 83.

WRENN, J. H., iii, 323.

WRIGHT, Justice, ii, 11.

*Written Extempore on a Half-Penny*, i, 257, 385, iii, 153.

WYCHERLEY, William, i, 77, 111, 139, 152, iii, 79.

WYNDHAM, Thomas, Lord, ii, 25-6.

WYNNE, William, lawyer, ii, 11.

YATES, Mr. and Mrs. Richard, i, 187, 222, iii, 126, 300.

YORKE, Lady Elizabeth, iii, 30.

YOUNG, Edward, i, 264, 283, 346, 384.

YOUNG, Rev. William, sketch of, i,

## INDEX

175, 344-5, ii, 332; the original of Parson Adams, i, 176, 344-7, ii, 434; witnesses agreement about *Joseph Andrews*, i, 316; revises Digby's *Wars of Alexander*, ii, 92; projects with Fielding a translation of Lucian, i, 47, ii, 371, 434; collaborates with him in a translation of *Plutus* by Aristophanes, i, 362-5, 396, ii, 433, iii, 81, 307, perhaps in the *History*

of *Charles XII*, i, 287, and in writing the *Examples*, ii, 270; revises the dictionaries by Ainsworth and Hedericus, iii, 80-2, 339-40; as contributor to *The True Patriot*, ii, 39, and *The Jacobite's Journal*, ii, 92; as collaborator in general, ii, 302, 371, 429.

YOUNGE, Elizabeth, iii, 106.

YOUNGER, Elizabeth, i, 97.









UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



130 002

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY